



*This page intentionally left blank.*

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 541	Last: Nash	First: David		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p>From: "David Nash"</p> <p>Date: Wed, October 29, 2014 8:28 pm</p> <p>To: <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p>Priority: Normal</p> <p>name: David Nash</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Historic,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic</p> <p>comments: The re-routing of I-70 to the I-76 / I-270 should be considered a viable alternative to expanding the current I-70 route. The northern route would allow less impact to communities especially if the current I-70 route were dismantled and turned into an avenue. I live in North West Denver along the I-70 corridor and use both 70 and 76 frequently, If I-70 were moved north to I-76 it would reduce bottle necks at I-25 and keep traffic flowing in a more efficient manner. As a resident likely to be impacted though this project I ask that the relocation of I-70 be evaluated to identify possible benefits of this alternative. Thanks David Nash</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	201	Last:	First: Natalie
<div><div>name: 'Natalie'</div><div>comment_topic: 'Air Quality,Historic,Noise,Swansea Elementary'</div><div>comments: 'I am very concerned about this new project. My family has lived in Swansea since 1956. We have experienced very few changes throughout the years. Our families are already exposed to the industrial environment. We do not need to Add more hazardous material to the air that our families breath.'</div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div>Hazardous material is adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on air and its impacts, please see AQ1 through AQ7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>	



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 410	Last: Natan	First: Daniel		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></b></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b> <b>From:</b> "Daniel Natan" <b>Date:</b> Sun, October 26, 2014 12:23 pm <b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>) <b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Daniel Natan</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Hazardous Materials,Managed Lanes,Noise,Property Impacts,Visual,Truck Traffic comments: Absolutely opposed to the current plan. We do not need to increase highway size or volume. We need to take this back to the community and come up with some alternatives to this plan( I.e. more public transport, another highway around the city, etc.)</p>				<p><b>A</b> CDOT must replace the aging viaduct. For the project’s purpose and need, please see GEN1 and GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>RTD’s parallel East Corridor commuter rail line is factored into the travel models and to accommodate future growth the additional highway capacity is required. For information on alternatives that remove I-70 East from its current alignment, please see ALT2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 010	Last: Nelson	First: Bob		
<p>Current Folder: <b>SDEIS Comments Responded to</b></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p><b>From:</b> "Bob Nelson"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Sun, August 31, 2014 11:14 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Bob Nelson</p> <p><b>A</b> <div></div> comment_topic: Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative comments: Please conduct a draft supplemental EIS for the I-270 and I-76 option. Thanks.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	216	Last:	Nemeth
				First:	Jeremy
<div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div>					
<div>Comment on preferred alternative</div> <div><div>From:</div><div>"Jeremy Nemeth"</div></div> <div><div>Date:</div><div>Tue, October 7, 2014 11:57 am</div></div> <div><div>To:</div><div>contactus@i-70east.com</div></div> <div><div>Priority:</div><div>Normal</div></div>					
A	<div>As Chair and Professor of the Department of Planning and Design at the University of Colorado Denver, I believe the preliminarily-identified preferred alternative should be reconsidered. I have reviewed the alternatives and several dozen comparable projects as part of my job.</div> <div>First, the alternative does not "stitch" the neighborhoods back together; we only need to visit I-25 as it runs through Wash Park to see that neighborhoods on either side of this sunken freeway are not "stitched together."</div> <div>Second, creating a park over a freeway is not a solution that fixes the problem of disconnected neighborhoods. I have also read that this solution serves to concentrate particulates from fast-moving (and idling) traffic below and is potentially deleterious to the health of park users.</div>				
	<div>Third, this is not a 21st century solution. Taxpayers are spending billions of dollars to build out our transit system. They are not interested in building more roads. We know that expanding vehicle lanes does not reduce traffic. With climate change and global warming becoming greater concerns, it is fundamentally irresponsible to increase the number of vehicle lanes.</div> <div>Fourth, in order to attract new residents to the area, and benefit existing residents, we need to show that we are a progressive, forward-thinking, innovative region. The preferred alternative is not one that is championed by urban leaders.</div>				
	<div>There are dozens of reasons why this solution does not work. Please reconsider the alternative of rerouting traffic up north. It just makes sense. I hope CDOT will be on the right side of history here.</div>				
<div>Jeremy Németh, PhD</div> <div>Associate Professor and Chair</div>					

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 518	Last: Neuman-Lee	First: Jeff		
<p>Current Folder: <b>SDEIS Comments Responded to</b></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p><b>From:</b> "Jeff Neuman-Lee"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Wed, October 29, 2014 12:51 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Jeff Neuman-Lee</p> <p>comment_topic: Hazardous Materials,Property Impacts,Other</p> <p>comments: I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative. As there is only industrial above Swansea, it makes sense to re-integrate that neighborhood into the city.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 591	Last: Newman	First: Laurie		
<p>Current Folder: <b>SDEIS Comments Responded to</b></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p><b>From:</b> "Laurie Newman"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Thu, October 30, 2014 3:45 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Laurie Newman</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Historic,Managed Lanes,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic,Other</p> <p><b>A</b> comments: In planning the transportation needs for the future, wouldn't it be prudent to take into consideration the addition of the Commuter Rail to DIA, coming through Union Stn in 2016? The rail, which goes to DIA every 15 minutes is intended to reduce car traffic to DIA, exponentially, and with far greater reduction in pollution and noise, than an expansion of I70 to accommodate MORE cars will. Also, please consider the massive influx of Millennial transplants that have been on the exodus to Denver and the large scale housing increase to accommodate them. This group of people is slated to utilize the increasingly updated developments in public transportation that has also been in the works in Denver, for this very reason. I'm curious as to why this is needed, considering these two points, let alone the slew of other negatives.</p> <p><b>B</b></p>				<p><b>A</b> Traffic modelling assumed commuter rail to DIA is in place for the No Action as well as all build scenarios. For information on how traffic forecasting model was determined for this project, please see TRANS5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p><b>B</b> Changes in driving patterns and multi-modal forms of transportation are adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information regarding consideration of changes in the driving patterns, please see TRANS11 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 695	Last: Nielander	First: Faith		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p>From: "Faith Nielander"</p> <p>Date: Fri, October 31, 2014 11:05 am</p> <p>To: <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p>Priority: Normal</p> <p>name: Faith Nielander</p> <p>comment_topic: Financing,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary</p> <p><div>A</div> comments: Please consider the alternate plan to link the expansion with 270/I-76 and save money and neighborhoods.</p>				<p><div>A</div> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 523	Last: Noirot	First: Tam		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p><b>From:</b> "Tam Noirot"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Wed, October 29, 2014 1:05 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Tam Noirot</p> <p>comment_topic: Other</p> <p>comments: I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	199	Last:	Norton
			First:	Erin	
<p>Current Folder: <b>SDEIS Comments Responded to</b></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p><b>From:</b> "Erin Norton"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Sat, October 4, 2014 9:10 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Erin Norton</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Noise,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic</p> <p>comments: My household is vehemently OPPOSED to the proposal for the current changes to I-70. I want to explore options to reroute the road outside of the urban area and around the city, especially for trucks passing through. It's an outdated and anti-urban renewal idea to widen the freeway through our most populated areas. This plan is not appropriate, will be bad for Denver and ultimately bad for any property owners along I-70. We should be working to reduce traffic, noise, environmental impact within the city and rerouting that through other suburban or less densely populated areas.</p>				<p><b>A</b> Several alternatives that realign or reroute I-70 have been considered during the EIS process. For information on alternatives that remove I-70 East from its current alignment, please see ALT2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	577	Last:	Nuss	First:	Kyle

*This page intentionally left blank.*



*This page intentionally left blank.*

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	585	Last:	O'Boyle
			First:	Matthew	
<div>Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to</div> <div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div> <div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div> <div>From: "Matthew O'Boyle"</div> <div>Date: Thu, October 30, 2014 3:03 pm</div> <div>To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (<a href="#">more</a>)</div> <div>Priority: Normal</div> <div>name: Matthew O'Boyle</div> <div><div>A</div><div><div>comment_topic: Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative</div><div>comments: I think the I-70 expansion would benefit Denver. I support the approved plan as it currently stands and am not desire the new road to the north of I-70</div></div></div> <div></div>				<div>A Comment noted.</div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Public hearing transcript	Document Number:	284	Last:	Ocampo
			First:	-	
<div><div>A</div><div></div><div>I just have a question. Is this a federal project or a state project? That park that you plan, why don't we spend some money—I don't know how much that's going to cost—why don't we spend some money to try to put an overpass on York? All of us, we live with the nightmare of those trains, and something has to be done. Those trains are about 3 miles long, and that really is a nightmare. I don't know whether you save the money from the park and try to do something with an overpass—it will be nice. Thank you.</div></div> <div><div>B</div><div></div><div></div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div>CDOT and FHWA are working together as lead agencies, which makes it a state project with a Federal nexus. Project decisions will need both State and Federal approval.</div></div> <div><div>B</div><div>Improvements to the railroad crossing at York Street are not included in this project. Denver has initiated an alternatives analysis for this area to identify potential safety improvements. For information on changes to the 47th and York intersection, please see TRANS3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Public hearing transcript	Document Number:	266	Last:	Ocampo	First:	—
A	I would like to ask a question. It's been many years since the project has been going on. Still, at this point, I don't know what to comment, but something that makes sense—everything is already basically set up, but anyway, I have a comment, not a question. I've seen prints of the project, but my question is, what's the objective of having six lanes in the new project? I don't see the solution of this mousetrap going west. There is only one lane on the south. I don't know what would be the answer to that question. I don't see any board or situation related to this part. I don't know if this is a question or just a comment.						
A	The project limits extend along I-70 between I-25 and Tower Road. The western limit is I-25 because of the high diversion of traffic from I-70 to both northbound and southbound I-25. Between 40 percent and 50 percent of traffic traveling westbound on I-70 diverts onto I-25. For information on congestion along I-70, west of I-25, please see TRANS4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.						

Comments				Responses to Comments				
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	584	Last:	Odendahl	First:	Kent	
<div>Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to</div> <div>Welcome: contactus@i-70east.com</div> <div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div> <div>From: "Kent Odendahl"</div> <div>Date: Thu, October 30, 2014 2:58 pm</div> <div>To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (more)</div> <div>Priority: Normal</div> <div><div>A</div><div>name: Kent Odendahl</div><div>comment_topic: Air Quality,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative</div><div>comments: I think it's very shortsighted and expensive to move forward with the proposed trenched highway. Rerouting the highway would very likely be the equivalent to the revitalization of what we see in LoDo and Riverfront part. Those wheels were set in motion 20 years ago and we are now starting to see it pay off. The current elevated highway is terrible. Spending the money to widen and lower or rebuild the elevated that was originally proposed is worse. Could be better utilized there and to move the current I-70 highway to a parkway.</div></div>								<div><div>A</div><div>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>



Comments				Responses to Comments
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 612	Last: Okerson	First: Sue	
<p>Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to</p> <p>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p>From: "Sue Okerson"</p> <p>Date: Thu, October 30, 2014 9:29 pm</p> <p>To: <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p>Priority: Normal</p> <p>name: Sue Okerson</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Hazardous Materials,Historic,Property Impacts,Truck Traffic</p> <p>comments: I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed widening and lowering of I70 between Tower Road and I25. As a north Denver resident who uses 170 and 176 daily, I believe there is enough evidence to suggest the widening and lowering of 170 is not advisable. I am specifically concerned about air quality, justice to the neighborhoods in the effected area and the amount of hazardous materials buried in the ground in that area. I have been stuck on I70 many mornings and evenings and believe the amount of traffic and pollution is harmful to the existing Swansea, Elyria,and Globeville neighborhoods along with Swansea Elementary. Widening and lowering the highway will only increase this pollution bringing more harm to these neighborhoods. These neighborhoods have faced pollution for many years, their property values have been effected. It is unfair to them as tax-paying members of our city to have to endure more pollution, years of construction and the demolition of 50+ homes. These folks are already living in one of the poorest areas of the city. Taking away their homes and adding more pollution is not worthy of our responsibility to our neighbors. I am concerned this area will become gentrified allowing the building of overpriced towers of apartments and condos that will be out of these neighbors price range. I believe the I70 viaduct needs to be torn down, streets rebuilt to re-join the neighborhoods and another plan developed to deal with traffic, including truck traffic. I76 is a possible alternative. I270 is a mess and needs upgrading, and there is plenty of land in that general area to build a highway around the city instead of through the city of Denver.</p>				<p><b>A</b> These concerns are adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on air quality in the project area, please see AQ3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on impacts to the Environmental Justice communities, please see EJ1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on CDOT’s plans for encountering hazardous materials within the project area, please see IMP6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on project mitigation measures, please see IMP1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p><b>B</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>

Comments				Responses to Comments
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 047	Last: Olds	First: Jean Ann	
<div>Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to</div> <div>Welcome: contactus@i-70east.com</div> <div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div> <div>From: "Jean Ann Olds"</div> <div>Date: Sat, September 13, 2014 1:13 pm</div> <div>To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (more)</div> <div>Priority: Normal</div> <div>name: Jean Ann Olds</div> <div>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Historic,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic</div> <div>comments: I am extremely opposed to CDOT plan of widening I-70. I believe this freeway should be re-routed along I-76 and I 270. My reasons stem from the health consequences that have already occurred and will intensify in the communities of Globeville, Swansea, and Elyria. I live in Berkeley, a division impacted adversely by I-70, and I attend church in Globeville. I would like to feel good about buying property in Globeville to be closer to Transfiguration Cathedral. These small communities deserve a chance to breathe normal air. Their health statistics are horrible. Increased incidence of asthma leading to obesity. Destruction of historic homes. Worse property values. The chance to have a real boulevard leading to increased commerce, property values, and community. There are so many reasons NOT to widen I-70,and so many reasons TO discuss alternatives, I do not understand the need for protests. The west moving to the east can still use I-76. Denver is trying to be a contemporary city, we need to follow the examples of other cities who have dismantled urban freeways and installed boulevards.</div>				<div>A The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>

Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Public hearing transcript	Document Number:	296	Last:	Olestki	First:	David
A	Hello. I'm a longtime citizen of Globeville and a 1965 flood survivor. We've had a lot of health studies in Globeville, and there's a lot of impact studies that we haven't done. One is of a mousetrap. You're going to turn 10 lanes into three lanes. It's already bottlenecking.						
	My main concern is flooding. If you build this underground—when I was 10 years old, I seen that river turn into a monster. And if we get this flooding—when we have storms to the west, to the southwest, and it goes back and forth, we get in real trouble in Globeville and in Swansea and Elyria. Our underpasses flood. It happens downtown. And if this underpass floods, you're going to possibly cost a lot of lives. And I don't know if the engineers have studied that. But if there is a very minute possibility that this can happen, it should not be built.						
	We should study the fact of taking it north and getting it out of our city and to stop all the health and all the fighting and bickering and let us be part of our neighborhood. These engineers that have decided to do this have never lived in our neighborhoods. We in this neighborhood want to be part of our neighborhoods. We want to have a say-so on what happens in our neighborhoods, and we look out for each other. That's why I'm here with concern of this tunnel possibly flooding. Like I said, if there's a minute chance that it will flood, don't build it.						
	Please look at our sides of the story. Look at reality. Look at history. I don't know if that's been taken into consideration. That thing is only—I don't know how they figured it. Thank you very much.						
						A	The project design will accommodate drainage, snow removal, and emergency vehicle access. For information on drainage of the Preferred Alternative, please see IMP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.
							CDOT has no current or future plans to widen I-70 west of the I-25/I-70 interchange in Denver. For information on alternatives that remove I-70 East from its current alignment, please see ALT2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 198	Last: Olson	First: Britt		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></b></p> <p><b>Concerned Citizen regarding the proposed widening of the I-70</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Britt Olson" <b>Date:</b> Fri, October 3, 2014 12:50 pm <b>To:</b> "contactus@i-70east.com" &lt;contactus@i-70east.com&gt; <b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>Hello,</p> <div><div><div>A</div><div>I am writing as a concerned resident of the Berkeley neighborhood. The following are my concerns/comments regarding the planned I-70 expansion:</div></div><div><div>B</div><div>-- Why was the full re-route that is on both the I-270 and I-76 not studied as part of the SEIS?</div></div><div><div>C</div><div>--I'm concerned about the health impacts of increased air pollution on the students attending Swansea Elementary school as well as the residents of the neighborhoods adjacent to an expanded I-70.</div></div><div><div>D</div><div>--I'm very concerned about the impact of imminent domain on the homeowners in the proposed construction zone -- not having a choice about wanting to sell/not sell one's home seems extremely unfair.</div></div><div><div></div><div>--As an almost daily user of either Berkeley park or Rocky Mountain Lake park, I'm extremely concerned that at some point the widening of the I-70 will extend further west than what is currently being proposed and that these two parks would be obliterated or VERY negatively effected.</div></div></div> <p>Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration,</p> <p>Britt Olson</p>				<div><div><div>A</div><div>The full reroute was considered and eliminated for several reasons. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div><div><div>B</div><div>Section 5.20, Human Health Conditions, of the Final EIS contains an expanded discussion of environmental health issues in Elyria, including the Health Impact Assessment conducted by DEH. For information on air quality and health, please see AQ1 through AQ7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div><div><div>C</div><div>The Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution provides that private property may not be taken for a public use without payment of just compensation. The Final EIS has adequately addresses property acquisition and relocation. For more information on the Preferred Alternative's property impacts and displacement of residents, please see PROP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div><div><div>D</div><div>CDOT has no current or future plans to widen I-70 west of the I-25/I-70 interchange in Denver. For information on I-70, west of I-25, please see TRANS4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div></div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Voice mail	Document Number:	072	Last:	Olson	First:	Hans
<div><div>A</div><div>Hi my name is Hans Olson. My phone number is 781-326-1111. I live in Cole Neighborhood and I definitely just wanted to comment that I like the preliminarily identified preferred alternative on the flyer that we saw regarding to what you guys are doing on the I-70 East. So, I definitely like it. Once again, my name is Hans Olson, I don't think there's a perfect alternative but this is certainly better than what's there now. Thank you. Feel free to call me if you'd like. Thanks. Bye.</div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div>Comment noted.</div></div>			

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 511	Last: Oropeza	First: Andres		
<p>Current Folder: <b>SDEIS Comments Responded to</b></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p><b>From:</b> "Andres Oropeza"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Wed, October 29, 2014 12:43 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Andres Oropeza</p> <p>comment_topic: Other</p> <p><b>A</b> <div></div> comments: I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	882	Last:	Orozco
				First:	Jesus
<div>9/24/2015</div> <div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div> <div><div>From: "Jesus Orozco" &lt;[REDACTED]&gt;</div><div>Subject: Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div><div>Date: Tue, October 28, 2014 10:48 pm</div><div>To: webmastercc@i-70east.com,contactus@i-70east.com</div></div> <div>email: <a href="mailto:jesus@denverrealestate.com">jesus@denverrealestate.com</a></div> <div>name: Jesus Orozco</div> <div>phone:</div> <div>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Historic,Managed Lanes,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic comments</div> <div>=====</div>				<div>A These concerns have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on the topics listed, please see the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 590	Last: Ortega	First: Michael		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Michael Ortega"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Thu, October 30, 2014 3:30 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Michael Ortega</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Historic,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary</p> <p>comments: I am strongly opposed to the current plan for a number of reason. First, I believe it is incredibly unfair to the communities that will be even further impacted by the highway expansion. I'm a Real Estate agent in the neighborhood and I know this is going to negatively impact housing values in the area which is a tragedy considering how much home values in these neighborhoods have struggled until recently. If this was a more affluent neighborhood I don't believe the city would attempt what it is currently doing. Not only does it impact the neighborhoods east of I-25, it is also impacting the neighborhoods west of I-25 especially in North Sunnyside, Berkeley and Regis. Buyers are hesitant to buy within 4 blocks of I-70 because nobody believes that to keep up with the traffic I-70 won't be expanded there someday too. I have yet to hear a valid reason why the alternative route of I-76 and 270 is not an option. Everyone who I have ever spoken to about this greatly prefers that option and believes it makes so much more sense. I would ask our elected officials to strongly consider other options before making a decision that could hurt thriving neighborhoods in Denver for years to come.</p>				<p><b>A</b> There are no impacts to communities west of I-25. To address impacts of the highway project, CDOT has identified mitigation measures above and beyond standard mitigation measures to alleviate the impact on these neighborhoods. For information on impacts to the Environmental Justice communities, please see EJ1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p><b>B</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project's purpose and need. For information on I-70, west of I-25, please see TRANS4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	




Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	786	Last:	Ortega	First:	Michael

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 475	Last: Owen	First: Heather		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Heather Owen"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Wed, October 29, 2014 6:02 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Heather Owen</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Noise,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual</p> <p>comments: "The expanded freeway and its new service roads will be well-within 100 feet of the wall of Swansea Elementary. Imagine the vibration, the pollution, the noise, the danger in getting to school [which serves kids from both sides of the freeway]. Their planned mitigation efforts can't possibly be enough. These kids deserve better." This states the case for me. I work at Swansea which is a vibrant community. The health and wellbeing of the children comes before any not well considered freeway plans. I also live in the Regis area and love my community the way it is.</p>				<p><b>A</b> NAAQS limits set by EPA protect human health. The modeled air quality values for the I-70 East project are below the NAAQS and demonstrate that there is no exceedance or impact from the project based on EPA's health-based standards for these pollutants. For information on air pollution near Swansea Elementary School, please see AQ3, AQ5, AQ6 and AQ7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>Swansea Elementary School has been identified as a very important and valuable resource in the Elyria and Swansea Neighborhood. The decision to keep the school at its current location was made during outreach opportunities conducted to review alternative sites for the school, and surveys of parents who were not supportive of alternate sites for the school. For information on project mitigation measures, please see IMP1, IMP3 and IMP4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on how traffic noise will be minimized after construction, please see IMP3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



*This page intentionally left blank.*

Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	839	Last:	Pablo	First:	—



**I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Please submit comments to the address below  
or via the I-70 East website (<http://www.i-70east.com>) by October 14, 2014.

Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.

Date: 11/18/14 Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
Name (required): Pablo Inchausti  
Organization: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address (required): \_\_\_\_\_  
City/State/Zip: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:

Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic
Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other		


Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.

A

No Mas Autos posibles  
el trafico se pone pesado  
cada dia mas

\*\*\*\*CONTINUE ON BACK FOR MORE SPACE\*\*\*\*

Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 14, 2014, to:  
I-70 East EIS Team  
Colorado Department of Transportation  
2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222  
Email: [contactus@i-70east.com](mailto:contactus@i-70east.com)



**A** La Alternativa Preferida reducirá el congestionamiento, por lo tanto mejorará el flujo de tránsito diario.

The English translation of this comment and the response is on the following page.

La traducción al inglés de este comentario y su respuesta se encuentra en la siguiente página.



C-752 January 2016

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 220	Last: Palestine	First: Alan		
<div>Current Folder: <b>SDEIS Comments Responded to</b></div> <div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div> <div>I 70 reconstruction</div> <div><div>From:</div><div>"Alan Palestine"</div></div> <div><div>Date:</div><div>Tue, October 7, 2014 6:11 pm</div></div> <div><div>To:</div><div>"contactus@i-70east.com" &lt;contactus@i-70east.com&gt;</div></div> <div><div>Priority:</div><div>Normal</div></div> <div><div>A</div><div><div></div><div>As a frequent commuter on I 70, I completely support the proposed below grade proposal for I 70. The 76/270 bypasss would be a disaster</div></div></div> <div><div>Alan Palestine</div></div> <div><div>Sent from my iPad</div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div>Comment noted.</div></div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 190	Last: Palmer	First: Daryl		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Daryl Palmer"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Thu, October 2, 2014 2:04 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Daryl Palmer</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Financing,Historic,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Visual,Truck Traffic</p> <p>comments: This is all moving too fast given that the SDEIS is based on insufficient data. Before moving forward, CDOT owes it to every citizen affected by the current plan to study the I-270 / I76 re-route plan. That plan would cost less, do a better job of improving the quality of life in more affected neighborhoods, stimulate the economy of those neighborhoods, and ultimately provide a safer highway travel experience in the years to come. At least that's how I see it. Others disagree. Let's find out!With more data, we can go to discuss our responsibility to historic neighborhoods that were seriously damaged by the initial construction of I-70. This is the perfect time to start fixing that situation. Why would we pass up the conversation?????</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project's purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	132	Last:	Palmisano
			First:	Delia	
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Delia Palmisano"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Wed, September 24, 2014 7:11 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Delia Palmisano</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Managed Lanes,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Visual</p> <p>comments: I am highly opposed to this project and feel it will divide these neighborhoods from the rest of the city even more than they already are. I have read that the re-routing of 1-70 to 270 and 76 is off the table, but I so wish that it was still an option as I think it would be much better for these neighborhoods and the city as a whole.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	495	Last:	Parker
				First:	Merlin
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p><b>From:</b> "Merlin Parker"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Wed, October 29, 2014 12:17 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Merlin Parker</p> <p>comment_topic: Other</p> <p><b>A</b> <div></div> comments: I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 033	Last: Parodi	First: Juan Pablo		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Juan Pablo Parodi"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Mon, September 8, 2014 8:35 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Juan Pablo Parodi</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Hazardous Materials,Noise,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic</p> <p>comments: Highways are a tremendous waste of real estate within city limits. Not only are they aesthetically displeasing, but they are notoriously dangerous parts of town and noisy for those who do live close by. Additionally, much of the real estate close to highways is unable to be developed, whether it be for zoning restrictions, or because few people in their right minds would ever want to develop real estate next to a highway. This is why rerouting I70 northward to 270 to I76 makes so much sense. It allows the city of Denver and the residents of Elyria/Swansea, Globeville, etc. to reclaim that part of the city. It would also create a tremendous opportunity develop the property around this area, making it more economically viable, aesthetically please for the city and residents of Denver, and accessible to all residents. I implore you to please make a decision about this that will benefit the residents of the city in the long run (like 100 years in the long run); not simply what's most convenient for moving traffic from point A to point B. Too often city planning decisions are made based on what's convenient for cars and traffic without considering what's best for people, land and space. The city of Denver greatly benefits by rerouting I70, and I hope you will make this decision for the greater good of the city. Thank you, Juan Pablo Parodi</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project's purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments					Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 394	Last: Patrick	First: Christopher		
Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a>						
<div>Proposed I-70 east project</div> <div><div>From: "Chris Patrick"</div><div>Date: Fri, October 24, 2014 10:17 am</div><div>To: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div><div>Priority: Normal</div></div>						
A	To whom it may concern,					
	<div>My wife and I bought a house in the rapidly evolving Chaffee Park Neighborhood 3 years ago. We are excited to live near downtown Denver. We have been closely following the proposal to update the dated I-70 viaduct for quite some time now. I know CDOT has spent considerable time looking into options for the best course of action. I am very distraught that our own state DOT has been quick to dismiss the one alternative that has gained the most support among the communities that will be most impacted by this project.</div>					
	<div>A reroute of I-70 around Denver is by far the most popular option to put more time and energy into investigating. While I don't have hard numbers in front of me, I find it very hard to believe that the scope of work is so much more than the proposed option of lowering and widening I-70 in it's existing location. The areas immediately adjacent to the proposed *reroute* corridor are for the most part wide open and/or surrounded by industrial property that could easily be absorbed to add width to the existing roadway.</div>					
	<div>I'm scratching my head about how the reroute could cost an estimated \$4B when the entire US36 project from Denver to Boulder is a measly \$500M. The absurdly high numbers for a proposed reroute simply don't make sense. I would interested in seeing hard figures that were developed to see where the additional costs come from. In the meantime, I sincerely hope that CDOT will put the brakes on moving forward with the existing recommendation until further investigation of the popular alternative can be conducted.</div>					
	<div>In closing, I will say that I appreciate all the work that has gone into fixing a problem that needs dire attention. I would hope the health of our city and the needs of our communities will come before the need to add more capacity for vehicles. Our city in particular and the younger generation is moving toward less traffic and closer knit pedestrian and bike friendly communities. Expanding the interstate right through the middle of Denver is a step in the wrong direction. Period. Thanks very much for your time and I look forward to hearing about how we are can work to find a viable alternative together.</div>					
Sincerely, Christopher Patrick						
<div>A The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>						

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 587	Last: Pearson	First: Zach		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p><b>From:</b> "Zach Pearson"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Thu, October 30, 2014 3:17 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Zach Pearson</p> <div><div>A</div><div><p>comment_topic: Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative</p><p>comments: I really like the proposed solution. It seems like a good balance of restoring the neighborhoods while providing the additional capacity I-70 needs without adversely affecting the transit system.</p></div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div><p>Comment noted.</p></div></div>	



Comments					Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 751	Last: Pechman	First: Dave		
Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to						
Welcome: contactus@i-70east.com						
Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM						
From: "Dave Pechman"						
Date: Fri, October 31, 2014 4:58 pm						
To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (more)						
Priority: Normal						
name: Dave Pechman						
comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Historic,Managed Lanes,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic,Other						
A		comment: Air Quality: More driving create bad air quality. Americans, including Coloradoans are driving less. There is no good reason to expand lanes to increase capacity for cars that don't exist. Why is this necessary? Environmental Justice: The people directly affected who suffered before and are suffering now will suffer again from displacement and in the future because these changes will simply increase traffic in the area. These are the poorest of the poor. They live near highways, factories, and refineries. How is that just? Financing: CDOT is playing fast and loose with the numbers. They don't have the money. They won't have the money. They will borrow it, selling off tolls in a P3 arrangement to a company that could eventually fail, leaving tax payers holding the bag. Tell the truth about the real costs. How is this honest or fair? Hazardous Materials: This area is already polluted. It sits in a river basin. Dredging and carrying away contaminates will further infect the people and wildlife, further degrading the health and welfare of the residents closest to the affected areas. And, increase traffic along the route increases the potential for future accidents including injuries, deaths, and damage to cargo both hazardous and non-hazardous. Why should this area, among the most contaminated in and around Denver, suffer for decades and generations? Historic: Historic neighborhoods in and around Denver exhibit structures and features that comport with our illustrious history. Many of these magnificent places represent the dearest and noble traits. Yet, the historic districts affected by the I-70 expansion fail to prosper to the same economic degree. Why is CDOT so willing to further degrade an historically significant place, including the buildings that showcase these neighborhood simply for the purpose of progress? Managed Lanes: The managed lanes are Lexus Lanes. The creation of these amenities simply exacerbates the tiering of services for those who can afford to pay. Politicians who lack the guts to				
B						
C						
D						
E						
F						
A NAAQS limits set by EPA protect human health. The modeled air quality values for the I-70 East project are below the NAAQS and demonstrate that there is no exceedance or impact from the project based on EPA's health-based standards for these pollutants. For more information on how air quality will be affected by this project, please see AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.						
Changes in travel patterns and the need for widening have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on why the project adds capacity to I-70, please see TRANS 11 and GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.						
B CDOT performed critical analyses that focused on specific impacts in these underserved communities, including some that are mentioned in the 2014 DEH Health Impact Assessment study: neighborhood and street connectivity, air quality, access to transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and relocations. To address impacts of the highway project, CDOT has identified mitigation measures above and beyond standard mitigation measures to alleviate the impact on these neighborhoods. See Section 5.3, Environmental Justice, of the Final EIS for more information.						
C Taxes would not be raised to pay for this project. For information on the project funding strategy, please see FUND5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.						
D Hazardous materials are adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on CDOT's plans for encountering hazardous materials and fugitive dust within the project area, please see IMP6 and IMP7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.						
E FHWA and CDOT are working closely with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and consulting parties to minimize potential effects and institute appropriate mitigation for historic properties. For information on preserving the impacted historic properties, please see IMP5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.						
F The need for Managed Lanes has been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on Managed Lanes and the benefits drivers of all income levels, please see PA7 and EJ2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.						

Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	751	Last:	Pechman	First:	Dave
F		tax appropriately balance the burden on others to pay fees. This amounts to a tax subsidy for the rich. When will CDOT tell the truth about toll lanes? Noise: More lanes mean more noise. I know. I live 1 block south of I-70. The drone of vehicles lulls me to sleep every night. And, it will just be a matter of time before CDOT expands I-70 to the west. In the interim, this expansion will create traffic jams as 10 lanes merge to 6 lanes. This is insane. It will create more maddening noise, choking pollution and chronic sickness that will reduce the lives and livelihoods of people who live in close proximity to the I-70. How many people will this expansion kill in the future? Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative: The best alternative is a re-route of I-70 onto I-270 and I-76. Yet, we are told that CDOT eliminated this option. That CDOT has to expand these interstates in order to perform the I-70 expansion shows the redundancy of such efforts? How much time and money will CDOT waste performing the same work twice? The data is old. The conclusions are wrong. Get it right. Property Impacts : Yet again, property will be taken, families displaced and businesses destroyed. Denver is in the midst of fantastic re-urbanization that creates more value than and I-70 expansion could ever contribute. Why can't Colorado, including the Denver Metro Area understand that interstate highways don't create urban value? Swansea Elementary: Yet again, school children will pay the heaviest price, as they have for decades. When it comes to spending money on programs to assist childhood heath, why do American ignore preventative care? Is it because there is no money to be made in preventing disease before it begins? It is insane to let children play anywhere near an interstate highway, and it is ludicrous to assume that playing on top of one is better than adjacent to one. Visual: I-70 in my neighborhood, Berkeley is an eyesore. Yet, West 46th Avenue, a fantastic boulevard is beautifully tree-lined. We walk our dogs on that street every day. Denver deserves better than Brutalist concrete ugliness. Truck Traffic: Truck traffic along I-70 is appropriately moved to I-270 and I-76 because these areas are already line with heavy and light industrial buildings and warehouses. Moving truck traffic there provides a perfect fit for large vehicles and the businesses that depend upon them for deliveries. The extra mileage traveled for long-haulers is miniscule. Other: The peer review and white paper produced by the American Planning Association reveals the countless mistakes that CDOT, the DRCOG and the City and County of Denver have made thus far in opaquely ramrodding this project through the process. This project is replete with errors in research, methodology, data, judgment, organization, communication, and coordination. We deserve better. Get it right. The price for getting it wrong will haunt the Denver Metropolitan Area for decades. When I emailed the APA white paper to James Howard Kunstler (esteemed author and regular commentator on urban ism) he replied, a Complete waste of public money, spending billions for gold-plated infrastructure for Happy Motoring in its twilight years. I couldn't have said it better myself. Waste of money. Waste of time. What is this so difficult for CDOT planners to grasp? Is it because road building for automobile transport is the bad habit CDOT cannot shake? For the sake of the planet, please stop. Dave Pechman					
G							
H							
I							
J							
K							
L							
M							
G		The Preferred Alternative creates the fewest noise impacts of any build alternative. The modeled air quality values for the I-70 East project are below the NAAQS and demonstrate that there is no exceedance or impact from the project based on EPA's health-based standards for these pollutants.  For information on how traffic noise will be minimized after construction, please see IMP3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.  For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
H		The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project's purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
I		All alternatives including No-Action require property acquisitions. For information on the Preferred Alternative's property impacts and displacement of residents, please see PROP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
J		The cover will directly contribute to improved air quality, resulting in PM10 concentrations that are lower at Swansea Elementary School and the surrounding area than they would be in the future without the cover (No-Action Alternative). For information on air quality and health in the project area, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.  For information on mitigation related to Swansea Elementary School, please see IMP4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
K		The Preferred Alternative will reduce the visual impact of I-70. Aesthetic and Design Guidelines for the corridor were developed with stakeholder involvement and will be used in final design. The guidelines are located in Attachment O of the Final EIS.					
L		Truck traffic is adequately considered and addressed in the Final EIS. For information on restricting truck traffic along I-70, please see TRANS8 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
M		The Final EIS addresses many of the concerns raised in the APA Peer Review. For information on CDOT's use of the American Planning Association's Peer Review, please see GEN4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 384	Last: Pechman	First: David		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p><b>From:</b> "David Pechman"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Wed, October 22, 2014 10:32 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: David Pechman</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Historic,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic,Other</p> <p>comments: Rerouting I-70 onto I-270 and I-76 will solve the problems created by the proposed expansion of I-70.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	442	Last:	Pelczarski
				First:	Sheila
Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a>					
Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM					
From: "Sheila Pelczarski"					
Date: Mon, October 27, 2014 8:03 pm					
To: webmastercc@i-70east.com ( <a href="#">more</a> )					
Priority: Normal					
name: Sheila Pelczarski					
A	comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Noise,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Other				
	comments: I live Denver's Highland Park neighborhood and use I-70 frequently to drive to DIA or the mountains or to meetings on the north central or northeast side of town. I have reviewed the proposed I-70 East expansion plan and cringe at the thought of the traffic nightmare that the submerged highway section could become, especially in the winter months during subfreezing temperatures when ice will form and be slow to melt. Will this section be safe for motorcycles during winter months? I think not. I ride a motorcycle year-round, weather permitting, but i would think twice before venturing into this subterranean section. I anticipate it would be called the "ribbon of death" after so many crashes and multiple car pileups occurred. This section will likely also be prone to flooding during heavy rain events. How will groundwater contamination be prevented if this section is below the water table and soil contamination from the Asarco Superfund site has not been adequately cleaned up? I also have difficulty envisioning a park above the multi-lane highway as a calming place to spend time with the constant traffic noise and air pollution that will waft up from below. I believe this park will cause more stress and poor health, contrary to the intended outcome. The below-grade highway would be too close to Swansea Elementary School. In addition, this proposed project would be absurdly expensive, an irresponsible use of taxpayer dollars. Instead, I urge CDOT to study in detail the proposed alternative that reroutes I-70 onto the existing I-76 and I-270 highways. This alternative plan that would turn the existing stretch of I-70 into a tree-lined boulevard makes infinitely more sense to me. It would be safer for area residents, would raise property values and stimulate business development, and would truly reunite the Elyria, Globeville and Swansea neighborhoods, at a much lower cost. I sometimes walk or ride my bicycle around Rocky Mountain Lake Park and Berkeley Lake Park, but the constant noise from I-70 traffic there is unnerving. If I-70 were rerouted, these parks would be much more pleasant places to spend time. Please give serious consideration to this sensible and much more cost-effective, alternative proposal. Please do an SEIS on the full re-route plan that includes both I-76 and I-270 highways. Thank you.				
B					
C					
A The lowered section will be designed and maintained with safety in mind and consistent with CDOT standards. For information on drainage of the Preferred Alternative, please see IMP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
B The inclusion of the highway cover with an urban landscape and a community space helps achieve some broader community goals of livability, quality schools, and safe streets along with supporting the existing communities along the corridor. In addition, the highway cover reduces noise impacts in adjacent areas. The cover will directly contribute to improved air quality, resulting in PM10 concentrations that are lower at Swansea Elementary School and the surrounding area than they would be in the future without the cover (No-Action Alternative). For information on the Preferred Alternative highway cover, please see PA1 and PA2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
For information on air quality near the covered section, please see AQ5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
For information on mitigation for Swansea Elementary School, please see IMP4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
C The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 479	Last: Pelgorsch	First: Laura		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b> <b>From:</b> "Laura Pelgorsch" <b>Date:</b> Wed, October 29, 2014 8:28 am <b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>) <b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Laura Pelgorsch</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Other</p> <p><b>A</b> comments: I'm very concerned this is not the best option. First, do we really need to expand I70 this much, including 4 new toll lanes? I travel on this stretch of I70 and even during high traffic times, the slow downs do not create that much of a delay. Second, the economic and environmental impacts on the neighborhoods are too high. The property values on adjacent homes would drop dramatically, with many people being unable to move. There are several schools that will be affected by the pollution and this is irresponsible to our youth. And a good way to decrease Colorado's future growth and economy. Third, the cost of this project is extremely high and taxpayers do not want their money spent this way. And finally, CDOT is creating an unsafe roadway that will cause accidents, including deaths, because the road does not get direct sunlight in the winter time. I would not feel safe on this road and would take other routes because of these reasons. CDOT has a responsibility to taxpayers and the community do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76 before moving ahead with this project.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>Other concerns mentioned in the comment have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on public-private partnerships, please see FUND2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>Designs for all alternatives will increase safety compared to the existing viaduct. The cover design will include lighting, wider lanes, and shoulders to avoid “black hole” slowdowns.</p> <p>For information on drainage of the Preferred Alternative, please see IMP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>The travel demand models used for the project analysis include transit alternatives and anticipated trends in driving and transportation as a whole in the Denver Metropolitan region. For more information on traffic forecasting and future driving trends, please see TRANS5 and TRANS11 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on encountering hazardous materials, please see IMP6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on community connectivity, please see PA1, PA2, and PA9 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	530	Last:	Pelgorsch
				First:	Michael
Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to					
Welcome: contactus@i-70east.com					
Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM					
From: "Michael Pelgorsch"					
Date: Wed, October 29, 2014 3:39 pm					
To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (more)					
Priority: Normal					
name: Michael Pelgorsch					
comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Managed Lanes,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary					
comments: I strongly encourage CDOT to consider the alternative reroute through the non-residential corridor of I-76/I-270. Independent studies have shown it's a cheaper, more environmentally friendly, and much less disruptive alternative to the current plan being considered. People living near I70 have life spans 3 years shorter than the rest of us on average. Why is CDOT blindly pushing through this current plan that will cost much more than a reroute alternative? CDOT is already selling off tax payer funded highways to foreign entities and claiming it's because of dollars and cents, yet they won't seriously look at a cheaper plan that also has many more benefits than just cost. Benefits of reroute option: - reconnects divided neighborhoods - less vehicular air pollution in residential neighborhoods - cheaper upfront construction costs - evenly disperses traffic between rerouted I70 and new Blvd. - safer - less water pollution - cheaper to maintain than a complex tunnel with water mitigation system					
A	Why current plan is wrong: - more expensive in short term and long term - air pollution in residential neighborhoods - more dangerous in winter due to highway being in the shadows and low southern sun inability to melt ice on roadway - water pollution from increased need to treat pavement in winter - pollution from sinking roadway into a buried superfund site - long term expense of running and maintaining system to pump water up from buried roadway - traffic jams caused by drivers instinctively slowing down as they dive down and under covered roadway (just look at any tunnel on I70 in the mountains). - flooding caused by heavy rain storms in sunken roadway - further alienating and decreased quality of life for residents in neighborhoods cut off by I70 - fewer people driving in the future means less need for wider I70. Is there not an RTD rail system opening up along that corridor? Current generation of people between 20-30 years old are not tied to owning and driving cars like previous generations. Please reconsider the reroute alternative. Not only is it cheaper now and in the long run, it's much better for the community as a whole. Regards Michael Pelgorsch				
A These concerns have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on the project's purpose and the need for 10 lanes, please see GEN1 and GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
For information on air quality and health in the project area, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
I-70 will be designed and maintained with safety in mind and consistent with current CDOT and FHWA standards.					
For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 689	Last: Pepperell	First: JoAnn		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "JoAnn Pepperell"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Fri, October 31, 2014 10:30 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: JoAnn Pepperell</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Hazardous Materials,Managed Lanes,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic</p> <p>comments: Why is this FAR better option not being explored and implemented? Re-routing I-70 onto a widened and improved I-270 and I-76 appears that it would effectively address I-70's traffic congestion on both sides of I-25 for half the money of the current preferred alternative and impact zero neighborhoods. The non-local traffic would drive 1.8 miles farther, but get to their destinations faster &amp; use less fuel, avoiding the bottleneck CDOT is about to create. The current six lanes of I-70 would remain six lanes, but as a boulevard " which is expected to handle traffic better, especially during rush hour. In total, there would be much greater capacity and 12 I-70 adjacent neighborhoods would be cleaner &amp; safer while creating wonderful economic development opportunities for large sections of undeveloped Adams County. A Much Better Plan for I-70!! The Re-Routing I-70 plan weaves the urban fabric of 12 neighborhoods back together. It moves non-local traffic &amp; its pollution to where there are no neighborhoods. Please consider this alternate plan!</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project's purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 757	Last: Peralta	First: Kathleen		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Kathleen Peralta"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Fri, October 31, 2014 5:46 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Kathleen Peralta</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Historic,Noise,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Other</p> <p>comments: Dear CDOT folks. I am a concerned citizen and resident of North Denver. I am very concerned about the proposed widening project of I 70 through our beloved city. In my opinion the environmental and community impact could be could be devastating. This is the time to look at other alternatives including rerouting some of the through traffic to I 76. I would like to see that alternative reconsidered and more community and environmentally friendly options considered for the existing section of the highway through Swansea. I think Smart progressive planning could make Denver a city to watched for innovative ideas. Let's not repeat the mistakes of the past. Enlist the best and brightest collaborate team that we have in this great state. We deserve it. Kathleen Decker Peralta</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project's purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments					Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 449		Last: Percival	First: Shane	
<div>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></div> <div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div> <div>I-70 East Project Comment</div> <div><div>From:</div><div>"Shane Percival"</div><div>Date:</div><div>Tue, October 28, 2014 10:57 am</div><div>To:</div><div><a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div><div>Priority:</div><div>Normal</div></div> <div>Dear Sir/Madam,</div> <div><div>A</div><div><div>I am a resident of east Denver (Stapleton) and frequently drive on the section of I-70 between I-25 and Tower road. My comment is in regards to the currently-rejected option of re-routing the section of I-70 to along I-270/I-76. I urge the group heading the redevelopment of I-70 to re-visit this option. I understand that there is a significant increase in cost in the re-routing option, but my question is whether the sale and development of the land which I-70 currently sits on between I-76 &amp; 270 could be structured to help pay for a substantial portion of this increased cost? Given the successful redevelopment of Stapleton and Lowry, having additional land in the city to develop, while also moving the highway to the city outskirts, but not too far, seems to make sense, both financially and socially, creating a better city for all of us, and for generations to come.</div></div></div> <div>Shane Percival</div>						
<div><div>A</div><div>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>						

Comments				Responses to Comments
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 639	Last: Peregoy	First: Dan	
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Dan Peregoy"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Fri, October 31, 2014 7:57 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Dan Peregoy</p> <p>comment_topic: Environmental Justice,Financing,Managed Lanes,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Visual,Truck Traffic</p> <p>comments: Dear Sir or Madam, I find it disturbing our roads are becoming more and more privately owned. I am not a huge fan of privately owned roadways, or anything that has to with public access. The last few decades have shown corporate greed is commonplace. This project I can only guess will become a huge money maker for whatever company controls the toll lanes to the point consumers will be gouged. I personally will not use the toll lanes unless it is absolutely necessary. I will find other routes to use. Again, I am guessing a good portion of the population will agree with me. This will create more traffic else where on the road ways through the nearby neighborhoods thereby increasing the danger factor to the residents of those neighborhoods. Would not a better alternative be to widen I-270 and I-76 be a less expensive and better option? There would be no need for toll lanes if these roads were widened. You could even go so far as to say heavy truck traffic must use the! improved I-76 and I-270 roadways to circle around the city. I also must say I am disappointed with CDot's performance of road projects in general. It is extremely annoying to sit and wait on I-70 for at least 1/2 hour because of paving operations. What happened to night time work? When 285 was improved through the Englewood/Sheridan area I cannot believe CDot closed all but one lane during the daytime creating a huge traffic nightmare. I understand due to the tax cuts during the Bush years less tax revenue is available for roadways. There has to be other ways to handle this besides creating toll roads which is an actual tax on those that use them. Thank you for your time.</p>				<p><b>A</b> State law requires that toll revenue be spent within the corridor where the tolls are collected and on transportation-related improvements. For information on the Managed Lanes Option and public-private partnerships, please see PA7, FUND2 and FUND3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on rerouting trucks and the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see TRANS8 and ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>



Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Public hearing transcript	Document Number:	269	Last:	Perez	First:	Armando
<div>A</div> <div>Good evening. I want to comment on this project that I am in agreement because this is going to bring more green areas to the neighborhood. I also want to make a comment. There has been talk of many subjects, but nothing has been said about the benefits for the ones that will live around the neighborhood near I-70. We want to know about all the benefits there is going to be for all the people around the highway. There's also talk about around Pecos there is going to be a rotunda. That area is very dangerous. If you don't stop doing that, it's a very dangerous rotunda with Vasquez Boulevard. I don't think this would really benefit people. Thank you very much. That will be all.</div>		<div>A</div> <div>Comment noted.</div>					




Comments				Responses to Comments
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 352	Last: Perez	First: Brandi	
<div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div> <div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div> <div>From: "Brandi Perez"</div> <div>Date: Mon, October 20, 2014 11:54 am</div> <div>To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (<a href="#">more</a>)</div> <div>Priority: Normal</div> <div>name: Brandi Perez</div> <div>comment_topic: Air Quality,Hazardous Materials,Noise,Swansea Elementary</div> <div>comments: I am a 24 year old mother of an active 2 year old girl. My grandparents, who raised me and 3 other siblings, have lived in Swansea for eight years. All four of us siblings now have our own children, whom my grandparents babysit. This I-70 expansion will greatly impact the neighborhood of Swansea among others in a number of ways. The most important being the air quality, the effect it will have on the school and students, as well as noise levels. The air quality in Swansea has already tested as one of the highest air pollution neighborhoods in the state, with traffic from the highway along with industrial smog coming from Commerce City as well factories like Purina. The new highway will only increase traffic to the area and further increase pollution rates. Digging up contaminated soil that will travel through the air and into my daughter's (and many other children s) nose whilst she play's outside and not knowing how it will impact her is not a risk I am willing to take. The noise from the construction will no doubt be loud and bothersome to residents but even worse for the staff and students at Swansea Elementary. The students will be distracted and the teachers will have to attempt to teach over the sound of bull dossers and tractors. And what about the school location? How is the expansion going to impact the school property, will they have to cut into the school's playground and even if they don't imagine all that contaminated dirt being blown around right next to where these children play everyday. The expansion is going to hurt the neighborhood more than help it.</div> <div>A</div> <div>B</div>				<div>A These concerns are adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on CDOT’s plans for encountering hazardous materials within the project area, please see IMP6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div> <div>For information on air pollution and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div> <div>For information on CDOT’s plans to minimize dust during construction within the project area, please see IMP7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div> <div>For information on CDOT’s plans to mitigate noise, please see IMP3 and IMP8 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div> <div>B Measures will be taken to minimize impacts to the school, including noise during construction and encountering hazardous material. For information on mitigating noise during construction, please see IMP4, IMP6, and IMP8 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Public hearing transcript		Document Number: 143	Last: Perez	First: Kendra	
A	I personally think as well that this project that they are about to do or considering doing kind of sucks. First of all, to build a bigger highway in a residential area I think is not good because they're going to be taking out a lot of people's homes as well as the businesses as well that are around there. There are people that have been living there, in the neighborhood—or their neighborhoods—have been living there for quite a long time, and I don't think it's right that, you know, just because they want to build a bigger highway that they push everybody out for the highway. I think they need to build it just the way it is now, just three lines in each direction and leave it at that.			A Detailed traffic modeling confirms the proposed improvements. For information on the need for 10 lanes, please see GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.	
B	To build a boulevard, there's a lot of traffic that's going to be going through the—or actually through our—residential area as well. And so I don't think that that's really an option.			B Comment noted.	
C	As well as the underground, I think that the underground highway that they want to—or are looking at building as well—is not good either just simply because of all the pollution as well is going to be staying underneath that. And to build something on top of it like playgrounds or whatever they want to build on top of it is not good either because that's very unsafe to have children playing on top of the highway.			C The modeled air quality values for the I-70 East project are below the NAAQS and demonstrate that there is no exceedance or impact from the project based on EPA’s health-based standards for these pollutants. Therefore, there are no projected impacts from the project related to pollutants covered by the NAAQS. For information on the air pollution levels near the highway cover, please see AQ5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.	



Comments				Responses to Comments																
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 168	Last: Perez	First: Kendra																	
<div><div><b>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</b><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 31, 2014.</p></div><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Date: <u>Sept 25-2014</u> Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Name (required): <u>Kendra Perez</u> Organization: <u>I-70 Project, Swansea I.</u> Address (required): _____ City/State/Zip: _____ Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p><table><tr><td>Air quality</td><td>Environmental justice</td><td>Financing</td><td>Hazardous materials</td><td>Historic</td></tr><tr><td>Managed lanes</td><td>Noise</td><td>Property impacts</td><td>Swansea Elementary</td><td>Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td>Truck traffic</td><td><u>Other</u></td><td colspan="2"><u>I-70 Project.</u></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.</p><div><div>A</div><div><p>I am making a comment on the I-70 project, because I live in the development that is supposed to take place. I think that it would be a better idea to move it out to I-70 because there is really nothing out that way and it won't impact the residential area any. If that can't happen then I think that they should rebuild the highway just the way it is now for one making an underground high is very dumb! This will impact our neighborhood. This means that everybody who has lived in this or these neighborhoods for a long time will now have to move because of this. That's not right.</p><p>***CONTINUE ON BACK FOR MORE SPACE***</p></div></div><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 14, 2014, to: I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p><div></div></div>						Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic	Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual	Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	<u>Other</u>	<u>I-70 Project.</u>	
Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic																
Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual																
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	<u>Other</u>	<u>I-70 Project.</u>																	
				<div><div>A</div><div><p>There is no solution that does not require property. The existing I-70 viaduct needs to be replaced because of its deteriorating structural conditions. Even replacing the same number of lanes would require more width in order to meet current design and safety standards. See Chapter 3, Summary of Alternatives, of the Final EIS for more information on the alternatives development and analysis process. The Preferred Alternative meets the project purpose and provides connectivity in the neighborhoods.</p><p>Several alternatives that realign or reroute I-70 have been considered during the EIS process. For information on the alternatives that removes I-70 from its current location, please see ALT2 and ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p></div></div>																



Comments					Responses to Comments		
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 168	Last: Perez	First: Kendra			
<div><div><div><div><div><div></div><div>I-70 EAST</div><div>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</div></div></div><div><div>A</div><div>B</div><div>C</div></div></div><div><p>Just Build it the way it is less time less money. We like our neighborhood. If you stop and think I-25 has been expanded out to 5 or 6 lanes each side and it is still congested. No matter if you make it under ground or leave it, they way it is it will not matter every highway has congestion. Under ground what happens when it snows or rains? raining it will flood and when it snows it will be very loud what about accidents? or when your car breaks down? if you are in the middle of the highway you have no where to go what about people who are closer pushing me personally I could not drive it because if I get stuck on there I would really freak out that is very scary to even think what would happen. Building the highway the way it is is a better disission, just because no one will have to move away or less there have that they worked hard for for many years. Bissness would not be in jeopardy as well. Stop and think if it was your house and your neighborhood, would you like it if someone came and pushed you out of it? No you wouldn't. Everyone worked and works hard for what they have and to be taken away from them in a blink of an eye is wrong. Everyone chooses to live where they want yes? well we choose to live there because we want to and like it, it's our neighborhood. So don't take it away from us. you could put noise barriers up for the noise, make medals to make it look nice. As far as a Blvd. I say no that's way to much traffic going through the neighborhoods. Not everyone has money to relocate somewhere else, we enjoy driving our routes we drive to get from one side to the other.</p><p>****ATTACH MORE PAGES AS NEEDED****</p><div><div><div>Thank you for your input.</div><div>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 14, 2014, to: I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div><div></div></div></div></div></div></div>							<div><div><div>B</div><div>C</div></div><div><p>The project design will accommodate drainage, snow removal, and emergency vehicle access. CDOT will develop emergency management plans for this facility as it does for every state highway. CDOT cannot control the extreme weather events or prevent every accident; however, the facility will be designed with consideration of extreme weather conditions and emergency vehicle access in the recessed portion. In addition, the highway is designed to the federal and state highway safety design standards to lower the risks of accidents. For information on drainage of the Preferred Alternative, please see IMP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p><p>All alternatives including No-Action require the acquisition of properties. For information on the Preferred Alternative's property impacts and displacement of residents, please see PROP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p><p>Noise barriers will be provided at certain locations. For information on noise, please see IMP3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p></div></div>

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 340	Last: Pertuit	First: Erin		
<p>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p>From: "Erin Pertuit"</p> <p>Date: Fri, October 17, 2014 2:55 pm</p> <p>To: <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p>Priority: Normal</p> <p>name: Erin Pertuit</p> <p>comment_topic: Financing,Historic,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Visual,Other</p> <p>comments: I am vehemently opposed to the current plans for I70. I am begging CDOT to do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Here is why it is important to me: 1. This is grossly unfair to Elyria Swansea and Globeville. You're taking advantage of an already impoverished community that doesn't have the resources to stand up and be heard. Imagine if you proposed widening 6th Ave through the Country Club neighborhood...plenty of people with money there that have resources and connections to protect their best interests. Not the same here. You're taking advantage, plain and simple. 2. I live in Berkeley. If the current plan goes through, in a few years you will try to expand west of 25, further impacting an OLD and ESTABLISHED neighborhood that is THRIVING. Why do this? Especially when you could impact no homes and neighborhoods by rerouting? 3. Two miles of highway underground sounds like a nightmare. A nightmare to build, a nightmare in the icy winter weather, and a nightmarish financial burden on tax payers that don't even want this. Again, I ask you to do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Erin Pertuit Berkeley homeowner and North Denver resident since 2000</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project's purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>The Final EIS adequately addresses environmental justice concerns. For information on impacts and considerations to the environmental justice communities, please see EJ1, EJ2, and EJ3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p><b>B</b> CDOT has no current or future plans to widen I-70 west of the I-25/I-70 interchange in Denver. For information on congestion along I-70, west of I-25, please see TRANS4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p><b>C</b> The project design will accommodate drainage, snow removal, and emergency vehicle access. CDOT will develop emergency management plans for this facility as it does for every state highway. CDOT cannot control the extreme weather events or prevent every accident; however, the facility will be designed with consideration of extreme weather conditions and emergency vehicle access in the recessed portion. In addition, the highway is designed to the federal and state highway safety design standards to lower the risks of accidents.</p> <p>The Managed Lanes are included to manage congestion, not to fund the project. For information on the project funding strategy, please see FUND5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project's purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 715	Last: Peters	First: Ezekiel		
<p>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p>From: "Ezekiel Peters"</p> <p>Date: Fri, October 31, 2014 1:41 pm</p> <p>To: <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p>Priority: Normal</p> <p>name: Ezekiel Peters</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Hazardous Materials,Historic,Managed Lanes,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Truck Traffic,Other</p> <p>comments: The original dividing of the neighborhoods by I70 and I25 has created tremendous negative social and environmental impacts on those communities. It is disappointing that the CDOT Preferred Alternative seeks to expand the roadway, destroying further homes and in return, radically increasing the number of vehicles pouring pollution down on these same neighborhoods. It seems that the most just thing to do would be to choose an alternative that begins to right these historic wrongs (perhaps one of the realignment alternatives). At a minimum, the No-Action Alternative should be chosenâ€”at least it won't make things any more unhealthy than they already are. Thank you.</p>				<p><b>A</b> These concerns have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on the No-Action Alternative, please see ALT1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on alternatives that remove I-70 East from its current alignment, please see ALT2 and ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on the benefits of the highway cover, please see PA1 and PA2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 311	Last: Phinney	First: Rich		
Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Spreadsheet</a>					
<b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a>					
I-70					
<b>From:</b> "Phinney, Rich B."					
<b>Date:</b> Fri, October 10, 2014 7:48 am					
<b>To:</b> "contactus@i-70east.com" <contactus@i-70east.com>					
<b>Priority:</b> Normal					
A	<div>Only travelers and those operating in a not-for-hire capacity should be allowed to use the elevated structure. Force "drivers" "teamsters" and commercial road hogs to go around the road and encourage them to do so at appropriate times. The tragedy of the commons is tragic only due to the attempt to make a good free. A highly variable fee for use on commercial vehicles would be a great start. Personal economic planning beats government planning by factors unimagined by "planners" (spelled fucktard). Use economics to solve this one, fellows.</div> <div>Rich Phinney</div>				

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 570	Last: Platt	First: Mary Catherine		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p>From: "Mary Catherine Platt"</p> <p>Date: Thu, October 30, 2014 1:50 pm</p> <p>To: <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p>Priority: Normal</p> <p>name: Mary Catherine Platt</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Other</p> <p>comments: Please consider re-routing I-70 instead of going ahead with the current plan to expand and bury part of the interstate. I-76 exists as a viable and much preferable alternative and would not present much of a detour at interstate driving speeds. I'm concerned about the impact of the current plan on our North Denver neighborhoods, safety issues with the tunnel in times of torrential rain, and the immense and unnecessary cost of putting an interstate underground. I strongly prefer rerouting to I-76. For the time being, please listen to your citizens and put the I-76 option on the table, give it equal weight with the current plan, and continue this process in a more democratic way. Thank you.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>The project design will accommodate drainage, snow removal, and emergency vehicle access. For information on drainage, please see IMP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	





Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 641	Last: Pohl	First: Robert		
<div>Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to</div> <div>Welcome: contactus@i-70east.com</div> <div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div> <div>From: "Robert Pohl"</div> <div>Date: Fri, October 31, 2014 8:15 am</div> <div>To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (more)</div> <div>Priority: Normal</div> <div>name: Robert Pohl</div> <div><div>A</div><div>comment_topic: Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Other comments: I support the Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative. I also appreciate all of the telephone town halls that, combined with other outreach, have allowed me to stay informed on this exciting project over the years.</div></div>				<div><div>A</div>Comment noted.</div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	503	Last:	Pollock	First:	Eric

Comments				Responses to Comments																		
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 825	Last: Portales	First: Bertha																			
<div><div>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</div><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 14, 2014.</p><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Date: 10-17-14 Would you like to be included on the mailing list? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p><p>Name (required): Bertha Portales</p><p>Organization:</p><p>Address (required):</p><p>City/State/Zip:</p><p>Email:</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle/select all that apply:</p><table><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air quality</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental justice</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financing</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazardous materials</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Historic</td></tr><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Managed lanes</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Property impacts</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Swansea Elementary</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visual</td></tr><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Truck traffic</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Other</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below</p><div><div>A</div><div>I don't know who you talk to and when who want this project the cover - community gardens, I don't know anyone I talk to who has major support over</div></div><p>***Continue on back for more space***</p><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 14, 2014, to: I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p><div></div></div>						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental justice	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazardous materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Historic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Managed lanes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Property impacts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Swansea Elementary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary identified preferred alternative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Truck traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Other			<div><div>A</div><div>Reconnecting the Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods was a core value identified by residents, and the Preferred Alternative includes the partial cover to address those concerns, based on input received. For information on CDOT's public involvement, please see OUT1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental justice	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazardous materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Historic																		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Managed lanes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Property impacts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Swansea Elementary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visual																		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary identified preferred alternative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Truck traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Other																				



Comments				Responses to Comments				
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	825	Last:	Portales	First:	Bertha	
<div></div> <div><div>B</div><div>AS FOR SWANSEA School - PARENTS WHO THINK ITS A good idea do not OWN A Home - Just Rent - and move overnight No Homeowner WHO HAS OWNED A home 30 or more years Agree with any of what you want to do to OUR Neighborhood Widening 46<sup>th</sup> Clayton - CDOT you will be in a big mess THANKS A Lot</div></div> <div><p>****Attach more pages as needed****</p><p>Thank you for your input</p><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 14, 2014, to: I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p><div></div></div>								<div><div>B</div><div>Long-time property owners and short-term tenants often have differing opinions about what is best for the neighborhood, however the public involvement process for this project has taken both opinions, as well as those of local jurisdictions, neighborhood associations, and businesses into account during the development and evaluation of the Preferred Alternative. For information on the Preferred Alternative's property impacts and displacement of residents, please see PROP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 592	Last: Price	First: Ian		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p>From: "Ian Price"</p> <p>Date: Thu, October 30, 2014 3:48 pm</p> <p>To: <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p>Priority: Normal</p> <p>name: Ian Price</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Visual,Truck Traffic,Other</p> <p>comments: I-70 should have never been built where it was in the first place. Cities that have had their highway through the middle of town removed have improved vastly. I would imagine that the I-76, I-270 route would be much cheaper, easier and faster to build. Even 4-blocks away, I can hear I-70 in the background. Look at Boston's Big Dig for ways to waste money and create a maintenance nightmare.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project's purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	550	Last:	Prichard
			First:	David	
<p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p><b>From:</b> "David Prichard"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Thu, October 30, 2014 7:02 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: David Prichard</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Property Impacts</p> <p>comments: I live in Globeville and live within 500 ft of I-70 already and have a respiratory illness problem and this will make it worse. plus I would more then likely have to relocate since the new highway would be 200 ft from my house</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. The modeled air quality values for the I-70 East project are below the NAAQS and demonstrate that there is no exceedance or impact from the project based on EPA’s health-based standards for these pollutants. Therefore, there are no projected impacts from the project related to pollutants covered by the NAAQS. For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6, and PROP4 on the relocation of residences that will not be acquired, located in the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 769	Last: Priebe	First: Maija		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Maija Priebe"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Fri, October 31, 2014 8:17 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Maija Priebe</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative</p> <p>comments: Please do not expand I-70 East into Downtown Denver. It will ruin the air quality in our neighborhood and will disrupt hazardous materials in the Globeville area. Specifically I believe that the Boulevard option along the I 76 route into downtown is a much better option for our neighborhoods. I know that cities like San Francisco have utilized the Boulevard concept which has increased businesses and property values in the area, rather than rebuilding larger highways into downtown. The traffic in Denver is a mess due to all of the expansion in the last 10 years and we need alternative routes and better mass transit in the metro area and into the ski areas. Sincerely, Maija Priebe</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>Hazardous material, air quality, and health have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on CDOT’s plans for encountering hazardous materials within the project area, please see IMP6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	





Comments				Responses to Comments
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 544	Last: Progross	First: Christina	
<div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div> <div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div> <div>From: "Christina Progross"</div> <div>Date: Wed, October 29, 2014 10:26 pm</div> <div>To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (<a href="#">more</a>)</div> <div>Priority: Normal</div> <div>name: Christina Progross</div> <div>comment_topic: Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts</div> <div>comments: I have several comments to submit about the proposed preferred alternative for the I70 alignment: 1. I am strongly opposed to the permanent closure of the York St exit. As a resident in the Cole neighborhood I use the York St exit frequently and strongly feel that the additional traffic this would add to the Washington St and Colo Blvd access points will be too much for these street to accommodate and will result in excessive traffic congestion and delays and negative impacts to the local communities along these routes. Please retain the York St exit in the selected alternative. 2. I am opposed to the proposed width of the alignment footprint and would ask that the width of the proposed expansion be reduced in order to limit the impact on immediately adjacent communities. I request that the final footprint be limited to 175 ft wide, in support of the Denver city counsel's request for a limited footprint. 3. I would ask that fair housing replacement (3 to 1) be given to communities immediately adjacent to the proposed expansion which would include low income and/or rent controlled units in order to accommodate the needs of these underprivileged communities.</div>				<div>A All interchanges within the study were analyzed and improvements are included in the Preferred Alternative to address projected traffic demand. The York Street interchange is being closed because of safety concerns. For information on the need to widen the highway, please see GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q. CDOT continues to look at ways to reduce the width and will continue to do so through final design.</div> <div>B CDOT will provide \$2 million in funding to develop affordable housing units in the Elyria and Swansea Neighborhood through available programs. For information on the replenishment of housing stock in the impacted neighborhood, please see PROP3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>

Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Public hearing transcript	Document Number:	280	Last:	Prosser	First:	John
A	<p>I've been an urban community planner for 60 years working all over the globe, and this reminds me of what the great baseball player Yogi Berra said, This is deja vu all over again. In this case, I live in Alamo Placita, which is a neighborhood that was done at the same time in the 1800s, and I live at 390 Emerson. In the '60s and the '70s, the State Department of Highways was going to take freeways through 6th Avenue all the way to Lowry and they were going to take superhighways through Lodo; and we opposed that. And because there was a socioeconomic and political group that was strong enough, they were able to succeed. Now, I have to read this because this is a statement directly from CDOT's own EIS of 2008, and I don't want to misstate it. It said the lower I-70 alternative was eliminated in that Draft EIS during the initial screening process since it would, and I quote you, require building the highway through the South Platte River basin resulting in unacceptable effects on aquatic and ecological resources and increased potential for encountering contaminated groundwater and soils. That is Exhibit 3.5, page 3.8, in the November document. You can go read it. Now, I will ask you, why are we beating a dead horse all over again and in the process trying to destroy three essential neighborhoods for this entire metro area? Stop 10.</p>			<p>A The alternatives enhancement and modification process started when the 2008 Draft EIS received more than 300 comments from the public and affected agencies. As a part of this process, PACT was formed, which included representatives from CDOT, FHWA, Adams County, Aurora, Commerce City, Denver, impacted communities, and business associations.</p> <p>After failing to reach a consensus on a Preferred Alternative and because of lack of public support for the 2008 Draft EIS alternatives, CDOT and FHWA re-examined the previously eliminated alternatives. The additional analysis resulted in development of a new alternative that is a hybrid of the below-grade and the tunnel alternatives previously considered during the project. The new alternative, called the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative, met the project’s purpose and need and also addressed the public and agency comments.</p> <p>The project team then worked with the communities and interested stakeholders to further refine the alternatives and preliminarily identify a Preferred Alternative that, with benefits and mitigation measures, outweighs project impacts to the Globeville and Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods.</p>			



Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	634	Last:	Prout	First:	John and Mary
Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to							
Welcome: contactus@i-70east.com							
Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM							
From: "John and Mary Prout"							
Date: Fri, October 31, 2014 7:40 am							
To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (more)							
Priority: Normal							
name: John and Mary Prout							
comment_topic: Air Quality,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Historic,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Visual,Truck Traffic,Other							
comments: Based on what we have read and our personal experience with the corridors discussed, we think that I-70 would best be rerouted over the already existing I-270-I-76 corridor. More room for expansion and less expensive in the long run. Thank you! John and Mary Prout							

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 533	Last: Prudence	First: Mark		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b> <b>From:</b> "Mark Prudence" <b>Date:</b> Wed, October 29, 2014 4:57 pm <b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>) <b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Mark Prudence</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Historic,Noise,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic</p> <p><b>A</b> comments: When did CDOT become in charge of community planning? These individuals are creating hideously complex, short-sighted and expensive projects to do nothing other than justify their own existence and paychecks. Perhaps if they lived in the communities that they plan further devastate their plans would be different. Think about the children whose life spans have already been cut short due to the pollution alone. Why would CDOT choose to further ostracize the impacted communities from Denver? What good can possibly come from this? I assert that CDOT must do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Thank you.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>Air quality and health have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on how the Preferred Alternative was identified, please see Section 3.3 of the Final EIS. For information on the benefits of the highway cover, please see PA1 and PA2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



Comments				Responses to Comments																		
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 170	Last: Pryor	First: Keith																		
<div><div><b>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</b><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 31, 2014.</p></div></div> <p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p> <p>Date: <u>Sept 25<sup>th</sup></u> Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Name (required): <u>Keith Pryor</u> Organization: <u>SELF</u> Address (requ): _____ City/State/Zip: _____ Email: _____</p> <p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p> <table><tbody><tr><td>Air quality</td><td>Environmental justice</td><td>Financing</td><td>Hazardous materials</td><td>Historic</td></tr><tr><td><u>Managed lanes</u></td><td>Noise</td><td>Property impacts</td><td>Swansea Elementary</td><td>Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td>Truck traffic</td><td><u>Other</u></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.</p> <div><div><div>A</div><div>1. We do NOT need to Expand the # of lanes or add toll lanes. we need to invest in BRT and additional capacity for rail along corridor if you build it like I-REX it will become congested as I-25 continues to be. DO NOT EXPAND the highway!!!! It is NOT preferred and NOT viable.</div></div><div><div>B</div><div>2. Locations of covers do NOT connect community the second cover makes no sense and needs</div></div></div> <p>***CONTINUE ON BACK FOR MORE SPACE***</p> <p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 31, 2014, to: I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <div></div>						Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic	<u>Managed lanes</u>	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual	Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	<u>Other</u>			<div><div>A</div><div>CDOT agrees that we can no longer build our way out of congestion. In fact, that is a main reason the Department is proposing to make the new lanes on I-70 East managed lanes with congestion pricing. These managed lanes give CDOT the ability to manage congestion over time, providing the guarantee of a congestion-free ride even as highway volumes increase. Further, managed lanes can encourage carpooling and transit use and enable more reliable and efficient transit service. Together, these strategies allow CDOT and FHWA to maintain a 10-lane template decades into the future, reducing the disruption to environmental and community resources that come with continual widening of roads. For information on the need for 10 lanes, please see GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q. For information on multi-modal considerations, please see TRANS1 and TRANS2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div> <div><div>B</div><div>The inclusion of the highway cover with an urban landscape and a community space helps achieve some broader community goals of livability, quality schools, and safe streets along with supporting the existing communities along the corridor. In addition, the highway cover reduces noise impacts in adjacent areas. The cover will directly contribute to improved air quality, resulting in PM10 concentrations that are lower at Swansea Elementary School and the surrounding area than they would be in the future without the cover (No-Action Alternative). For information on walkability and bicycle routes improvement, please see TRANS2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q. The costs for the bicycle and pedestrian improvements identified in the Preferred Alternative and in the Final EIS mitigation measures are included in the project cost estimate, and are not cost prohibitive.</div><p>CDOT recognizes that the lowered highway does eliminate the ability of residents to casually cross under the viaduct. However, we also have heard concern from residents about the feeling of unsafe passage along this route in addition to the visual and psychological barrier provided by the viaduct that has served to divide these communities for the past five decades. For information on community connectivity, please see PA1, PA2, and PA9 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p></div>	
Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic																		
<u>Managed lanes</u>	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual																		
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	<u>Other</u>																				



Comments					Responses to Comments
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	170	Last: Pryor	First: Keith
B	<div><div></div><div><p>2 (CONT) TO BE RELOCATED TO FACILITATE BETTER COMMUNITY CONNECTION</p><p>3. COVER OPTION IS ACTUALLY WORSE FOR BIKES AND PEDESTRIANS IT LACKS THE CURRENT LEVEL OF ACCESS AND CONNECTIONS THAT THE RAISED VIADUCT CURRENTLY OFFERS THE COMMUNITY. THIS INTERM MAKES THE AREA MORE CAR DEPENDANT LESS CONNECTED WHICH IS A BIG HEALTH CONCERN WHEN PEOPLE LOSE A HEALTHY ALTERNATIVE TO NAVIGATING <del>THAT</del> THERE COMMUNITY AS WELL AS CONNECT TO THE LARGER METRO AREA.</p><p>THIS AREA NEEDS HEALTHY ALTERNATIVES SUCH AS WALKING &amp; BIKING AND THE COVER OPTION REMOVES THAT OPTION &amp; CONNECTIVITY. IF IT IS SELECTED MUCH MORE IS NEEDED FOR PROPER BIKE FACILITIES AND PED CONNECTIONS.</p><p>****ATTACH MORE PAGES AS NEEDED****</p><div><div>Thank you for your input.</div><div>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 31, 2014, to: I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div><div></div></div></div></div>				<div>The information on these pages has been reviewed. Responses to specific comments are included on the previous page.</div>



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Public hearing transcript		Document Number: 262	Last: Pryor	First: Keith	
A	<p>This really is a disaster. We do not need to expand the highway to include additional lanes and toll lanes. Instead we need to invest in other options such as bus rapid transit and additional capacity on our rails to facilitate for the additional capacity needs. This community does not need to have further destruction of their community to facilitate for this.</p>				
	<p>T-REX was a disaster. It expanded the highway, and it's still absolutely congested and has done nothing to alleviate what is said to be congestion for the I-70 corridor. So we've done this once before, and we've seen the results. It does not work.</p>				
B	<p>The covering of the highway, their placements do not necessarily make a lot of sense. It is not improving bicycle and pedestrian connections. This is actually going to be much worse for bikes and pedestrians. And the cost of building bike facilities as well as pedestrian facilities to cross the new expanded lanes of the highway will be cost prohibitive and will never get done given their costs. As a result, this area will continue to be car dependent, which is a huge health concern as our obesity rates continue given that we have no alternatives for people to connect with their community and their greater area based on alternative modes such as walking and bicycling. And so this really is a detriment to the community, to bicycle connections and networks as well as the pedestrian network and experience.</p>				
	<p>The viaduct system has much more connectivity for the community as it provides more opportunities to cross under the highway as well for bikes to cross—safely cross—under the highway as there will not be enough facilities built for this to happen as it's currently designed.</p>				
A	<p>The inclusion of the highway cover with an urban landscape and a community space helps achieve some broader community goals of livability, quality schools, and safe streets along with supporting the existing communities along the corridor. In addition, the highway cover reduces noise impacts in adjacent areas. The cover will directly contribute to improved air quality, resulting in PM10 concentrations that are lower at Swansea Elementary School and the surrounding area than they would be in the future without the cover (No-Action Alternative). For information on the project’s improvement of walkability and bicycle routes, benefits of the cover, and information on a second cover, please see TRANS2, PA1, PA2, PA4, PA8, and PA9 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>				
B	<p>The I-70 viaduct needs to be replaced because of its deteriorating structural conditions; however, it cannot be replaced exactly as it is now. The footprint of the roadway needs to be expanded to meet current design and safety standards. CDOT recognizes that the lowered highway does eliminate the ability of residents to casually cross under the viaduct. However, we also have heard concern from residents about the feeling of unsafe passage along this route in addition to the visual and psychological barrier provided by the viaduct that has served to divide these communities for the past five decades.</p> <p>Managed Lanes are included in the project in response to the I-25 situation. For information on identification of Managed Lanes Option as the preferred Option, please see PA7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>Air quality and health are adequately addressed in the Final EIS; please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>				

Comments					Responses to Comments
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	389	Last: Pryor	First: Keith
Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a>					
<div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div>					
<div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div> <div><div>From: "Keith Pryor"</div><div>Date: Thu, October 23, 2014 10:48 am</div><div>To: <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</div><div>Priority: Normal</div></div>					
<div><div>name: Keith Pryor</div><div><div>A</div><div><div>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Historic,Property Impacts,Other</div><div>comments: The selected alternative is Not the right solution. I-70 needs to be rebuilt as it currently exist. The proposed options further cuts off acess between neighborhoods for bike and pedestrians a key issue. As the new ped bridges will not be sufficient and further cause these neighborhoods to be car dependant and further issues w health and quality of life issues that affec lower income neighborhoods.No atter how wide you make I-70 it will be congested just as I 25 is after t rex. This is not the right answer. Alternative modes need to be enhanced along the coridor. Qulity of life and socil justice for the neighborhoods along the coridor are critical. Do not widen I 70 it does nothing to deal w the issue.</div></div></div></div>					
<div><div>A</div><div>CDOT agrees that we can no longer build our way out of congestion. In fact, that is a main reason the Department is proposing to make the new lanes on I-70 East managed or tolled lanes with congestion pricing. These managed lanes give CDOT the ability to manage congestion over time, providing the guarantee of a congestion-free ride even as highway volumes increase. Further, managed lanes can encourage carpooling and transit use and enable more reliable and efficient transit service. Together, these strategies allow CDOT and FHWA to maintain a 10-lane template decades into the future, reducing the disruption to environmental and community resources that come with continual widening of roads. In addition to other modes of transportation, this is one tool manage future congestion. For information on other multimodal forms of transportation, please see TRANS1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>					

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Voice mail	Document Number:	878	Last:	Pula
		First:	Lisa		
<div><div>A</div><div><div>Lisa Pula</div><div>Hello my name is Lisa Pula. I am just calling because I am a person who is definitely for rerouting the interstate from Wadsworth and I-70 around 270 and the I-76 corridor and definitely against the lowering of the road through the central neighborhood. Most cities have major traffic routed around the city and then your boulevards within the city for the neighborhoods. I think the option of lowering the interstate would still cause tremendous problems for both of those communities. Thanks, bye.</div></div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	617	Last:	Pulsinelli
				First:	Melissa
<div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div> <div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div> <div>From: "Melissa Pulsinelli"</div> <div>Date: Thu, October 30, 2014 10:09 pm</div> <div>To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (<a href="#">more</a>)</div> <div>Priority: Normal</div> <div><div>A</div><div><div>name: Melissa Pulsinelli</div><div>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Hazardous Materials,Other</div><div>comments: I only wish for the decision to recognize the social justice of a marginalized neighborhood over the needs of commuters. I love in NW Denver and work in Holly Square. I would gladly reroute my commute to the north and add time to my commute to better the health, well being and quality of life for those that have been forced to sacrifice all of this to shorten the commute of those of us that do not work in the neighborhoods we reside. It can be that simple if we think forward. Please put serious consideration into this option.</div></div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div><div>Environmental justice considerations have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS; please see EJ1, EJ2, and EJ3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>	

*This page intentionally left blank.*





*This page intentionally left blank.*



## Responses to Comments

First: Ramon

**La traducción al inglés  
de este comentario  
y su respuesta se  
encuentra en la  
siguiente página.**

A



Comments				Responses to Comments															
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 242	Last: Quesada	First: Ramon															
<div><div><div></div><p>Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Date: <u>9-21-14</u> Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p><p>Name (required): <u>Ramon Quesada</u></p><p>Organization: _____</p><p>Address (required): _____</p><p>City/State/Zip: _____</p><p>Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p><table border="0"><tr><td>Air quality</td><td>Environmental justice</td><td>Financing</td><td>Hazardous materials</td><td>Historic</td></tr><tr><td>Managed lanes</td><td>Noise</td><td>Property impacts</td><td>Swansea Elementary</td><td>Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td>Truck traffic</td><td>Other</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.</p><p><b>A</b> <span style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 20px; vertical-align: middle;"></span> How much is the project going to cost?</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><div><div><div><b>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</b></div><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 31, 2014.</p></div><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 31, 2014, to:</p><p>I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p><div></div></div></div></div> <div><div><div><b>A</b></div><div>Updated costs are included in the Final EIS. For information on the project cost and funding strategy, please see FUND5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div><div><div>This is a translation of the previous comment and response that was submitted in Spanish originally.</div><div>Esta es una traducción del comentario anterior y su respuesta que se presentó originalmente en español.</div></div></div>					Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic	Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual	Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other		
Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic															
Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual															
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other																	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Public hearing transcript	Document Number:	154	Last:	Quinn
			First:	Marilyn	
A	I live in northwest Denver. I won't take anything like four minutes because I'll put some more detailed comments in writing. But I wanted to give some overall comments, one of which started 20 years ago when I worked on a community project with a fellow who went on to become the executive director of the American Association of Transportation Planners who said to me, "They would never design the interstate system today the way they did it in the 50's because it crushed communities." So when I saw the layout for this trench concept, I said, "That won't last long because that's been rethought many times." And so I'm terribly disappointed to know that it's not being rethought, but it's being carried forward.			A CDOT recognizes that the project passes through environmental justice neighborhoods, and it has identified mitigation measures above and beyond standard mitigation measures to alleviate the impact on those neighborhoods. See Section 5.3, Environmental Justice, of the Final EIS for more information.	
	So as a person who was born and raised in rural Colorado where I think we will see some damage out there. When the bridge maintenance funds are used over the course of 20 years, rural Colorado will be the people who will pay for that. But the folks who will pay the dearest price are the folks that live right next door in the communities that we are in right now, and their children are breathing very polluted air. And so I put all that down somewhere else. But highways shouldn't crush community. And there is no reason that this can't go around. The reason they started building the beltways was because they decided it wasn't a good idea to run highways right through communities. And I would just like to say thanks to Baltimore who said, "No, you're not coming through our neighborhood." They began to rethink that. I think that there's time for you to explore other possibilities. But I really think that this expense will not serve the citizens of any part of Denver well at all, and I encourage you to rethink this. And I look forward to communicating more later in writing.			The need to fund replacement of the I-70 viaduct was one reason the Colorado Bridge Enterprise was created. For information on the project funding strategy, please see FUND5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.  Alternate routes were considered and adequately addressed in the Final EIS, please see ALT2 and ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.  Air quality and health concerns were adequately addressed in the Final EIS, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 739	Last: Quinn	First: Marilyn	
<div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div>					
<div>Comment on I-70 East proposal</div> <div>From: "Marilyn Quinn"</div> <div>Date: Fri, October 31, 2014 3:32 pm</div> <div>To: "contactus@i-70east.com" &lt;contactus@i-70east.com&gt;</div> <div>Priority: Normal</div>					
A	<div>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the CDOT proposal to expand I-70 in the vicinity of Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea. My comments relate to:</div> <div>Other (Integrity and Quality of the Project Design and Planning Process)</div> <div>Air Quality</div> <div>Environmental Justice</div> <div>Financing</div> <div>Historic</div> <div>Hazardous Materials</div> <div>Preliminary Identified Preferred Alternative</div> <div>Property Impacts</div>				
	<div>I have followed the CDOT Preferred Alternative by reading newspaper articles and editorials, attending a community meetings, as well as a CDOT-sponsored public meeting. My feelings all along have been that this project makes no sense. I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative for the reasons stated below. I recently had an opportunity to review the APA peer report (October 15, 2014). I am pleased to see that my concerns about the Preferred Alternative are, at least in part, supported by the work of these professionals. I trust that their concerns will be addressed by DRCOG and Denver's City Council.</div>				
B	<div>INTEGRITY &amp; QUALITY OF THE PROJET DESIGN AND PLANNING PROCESS / PRELIMINARY IDENTIFIED PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE</div>				
	<div>I concur with the APA report that the current CDOT plan "lacks a systemic, longterm perspective." Indeed, the plan would accomplish little in the I-70 corridor except create a bottleneck just west of the Globeville, Swansea, and Elyria area. I cannot doubt that CDOT would immediately seek to expand the next section of I-70, crushing additional communities in the process and spending billions more dollars in the process.</div> <div>Members of the community have repeatedly asked why the planning did not fully consider the northern re-route or the fact that fewer people are driving, and why the expansion of Fast Tracks (welcomed and well-used by Denver area commuters) wasn't included. Now it is clear why this was not done: CDOT and its contractor used out-of-date modeling tools, and failed to consider "highway induced development." It appears that leadership at CDOT designed the planning process to support their Preferred Alternative, rather than letting facts and public opinion guide development of a workable plan.</div>				
		<div>A The Final EIS addresses many of the concerns raised in the APA Peer Review. For additional information on CDOT’s use of the APA Peer Review, please see GEN4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div> <div>B Several alternate routes were considered and adequately addressed in the Final EIS, including the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative; please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div> <div>The alternatives being evaluated were developed to avoid some impacts, minimize others, and mitigate the remaining impacts that could not be avoided or minimized.</div>			



Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	739	Last:	Quinn	First:	Marilyn
B	<p>Throughout the process, CDOT and the Denver City Council have argued that the three most-affected neighborhoods would be re-united with Denver by this enormous expansion, and have said that any problems would be mitigated. That defies logic. Every time I've heard it, my faith in the integrity of the project and City of Denver leadership has sunk further.</p> <p>So many of my concerns are precisely addressed in the APA report that I will not re-state them here, but I believe they have hit the mark. If we are to undertake alterations to I-70 through the City of Denver, the project should reduce the footprint and the impact of the project on neighborhoods.</p>						
	<p>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE / AIR QUALITY</p> <p>The Proposed Alternative would further expose the residents of Globeville, Swansea, and Elyria to dangerous emissions of the sort that have already diminished their health and life expectancy significantly compared with that of the rest of the City, and of similar-income sections of the City. We should all be ashamed that some of our most powerless citizens have been exposed for so many years to air quality that has weakened their respiratory systems and caused so many of them to have chronic conditions like asthma.</p> <p>The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires that reasonable alternatives to highway construction be considered would have prevented I-70's construction. Expansion in this area should certainly be in violation of the spirit of this Act, if not the letter of the law. Has this legality been determined?</p> <p>The Civil Rights Act of 1964 would have prevented this highway from dissecting these neighborhoods, had it been in existence when I-70 was built. An expansion of this side, further isolating these low-income, minority neighborhoods, if not illegal, is obviously in violation of the spirit of the law and more current sensibilities.</p> <p>Transportation planners have for many years acknowledged the damage done to neighborhoods and cities when the interstate system was built, and have said that it would not be built that way today. That is why beltways have been added around many cities, and that is what should be done in Denver. I support the full re-routing of I-70 to I-270 and I-76, which would avoid existing residential communities. The Environmental Justice Act of 1994, had it been in effect when I-70 was originally planned, would have prevented its ever being built. Tripling the width of the footprint must certainly be in violation of this law.</p> <p>CDOT and the City of Denver have stated that widening I-70 will re-unite these neighborhoods with Denver. However, such statements are unconvincing. If past practice continues, most of the considerations will never be implemented. Since the I-70 project funding won't pay for them, they will depend on the City's budget priorities and other initiatives that will likely push them aside.</p>						
D	<p>Air quality in this area will undoubtedly suffer by allowing cars to travel high speeds, or sit in endless traffic jams with even fewer exits. This is an area that was mentioned in the APA report, and one that should be given extremely careful review.</p>						
E	<p>FINANCING</p> <p>It appears that CDOT has not included the cost of financing the project, but financing will most certainly be required. This naturally understates the cost of the Preferred Option, tipping the scale inappropriately in its direction. Furthermore, the proposed diversion of the equivalent of 8 years of state bridge maintenance funds to this project causes me great concern. It is common knowledge that bridge maintenance in Colorado and the United States has been dangerously</p>						

C	<p>CDOT recognizes that the project passes through environmental justice neighborhoods, and it has identified mitigation measures above and beyond standard mitigation measures to alleviate the impact on those neighborhoods. See Section 5.3, Environmental Justice, of the Final EIS for more information. For more information in response to comments received on environmental justice, please see EJ1, EJ2, and EJ3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>Alternate routes, air quality, and community connectivity have all been adequately addressed in the Final EIS.</p> <p>For information on alternate routes, please see ALT2 and ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on community connectivity, please see PA1, PA2, and PA9 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>All mitigation measures included in the Record of Decision must be implemented because it is a legally binding document.</p>				
	<p>The MSAT and NAAQS air quality analysis performed for the Final EIS shows that overall emissions will decrease in the future because of improved mobility, reduced congestion, and cleaner vehicle emission standards. For information on air quality, please see AQ3, AQ5, and AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>The Final EIS describes the funding options available to CDOT in Section 8.6. For a summary of the project funding strategy, please see FUND5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>The new roadway will not be on a bridge and will, therefore, require a smaller portion of CDOT's bridge maintenance budget in the future if the viaduct is replaced.</p>				

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 739	Last: Quinn	First: Marilyn	
E		neglected. Using these scarce funds for a project that may well prove unnecessary is inexcusable.			
		HISTORIC			
F		In section 106 (Determination of Eligibility and Effects), it appears that many affected properties are considered eligible for historic designation according to the National Register, and several areas have the potential to be historic districts. It is disturbing that research on these properties is so incomplete, and the decision to demolish or adversely affect them was taken so lightly. Objections to this effect have been brushed aside, with the intention to suppress further research: see Dianna Litvak's response, admitting that the site survey forms were deficient but fearing that repair would open "a Pandora's box." With this kind of admission, the validity of the entire section of the SEIS suspect.			
		One significant historic loss would be the Colonial Motel, which your own report states is a rare existing example of the 1940's motor lodge. There are many others, but the entire section should be re-done correctly. National Register determination should be used instead of the in depending contractor that was used.			
G		PROPERTY IMPACTS			
		The current property owners appear likely to suffer economically as a result of this project. The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policy of 1970 ensures assistance and affordable relocation for those who will be losing their properties. But since many of them are non-native speakers of English, and as low-income citizens they may not have good independent financial advice, they may well suffer loss of some of Denver's last affordable housing and be unable to buy anything else in this area of high-cost homes. There is no independent agency to help those being approached by CDOT with offers to buy their properties, and may be unaware that they can negotiate with CDOT.			
H		The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 says that any Federally financed project must be carried out in the best overall public interest. As a resident of Denver, I object to the disruption and division of these neighborhoods. I don't see how it can be in their best interest, and it is not in the best interest of the City of Denver to have less affordable housing in stable neighborhoods close to the city core. Home ownership in these neighborhoods is very high, which is a good thing for Denver and for these low-income neighbors. They have endured a lot over the years, and exposing them to the impact of this Proposed Alternative is unfair in the extreme.			
		HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
H		The SEIS does not provide information on the disposal of 1.8 million yards of contaminated soil. Where will this hazardous material go? Which communities will be affected? How will they be protected? There has been no analysis on the environmental impact of 50,000 to 75,000 round trips by trucks full of dirt or equipment being used to expand I-70. Yet, there will most certainly be several years' impact on air quality and exposure to hazardous materials. How will the project meet Denver's 2020 Sustainability Goals, which mandate a decrease in energy consumption?			
		I urge CDOT, Denver City Council, and other elected and appointed officials to step back from their Preferred Alternative, and take time to address my concerns, those of my neighbors, and the issues raised in the APA Peer Review Report. If that is done, I feel sure that the Preferred Alternative will be shelved in favor of options that far better fit Denver's needs and objectives.			
F		The noted correspondence between consulting parties and technical experts demonstrates the progression of concurrence, which sometimes requires back-and-forth dialogue and updates to incomplete or insufficient forms. Ultimately, SHPO and consulting party concurrence indicates their satisfaction with the entire process. For information on impacted historic properties, please see IMP5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.			
		A right-of-way specialist will be assigned to each property owner to help them understand and navigate this process with translation as needed. For information on the Preferred Alternative's property impacts and displacement of residents, please see PROP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.			
H		Plans for removal of contaminated soil have not been developed yet, but will be prior to the start of construction. Any soil contamination would be addressed prior to the beginning of construction in any area, as required by law and the mitigation measures committed in the Final EIS. For information on CDOT's plans for encountering hazardous materials within the project area, please see IMP6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.			
		The analysis for the Final EIS estimates that the range of expended energy between alternatives is relatively low. This includes the No-Action Alternative, which has slightly lower operational energy consumption as compared to the other Build Alternatives because the alternative proposes fewer lanes. See Section 5.11, Energy, of the Final EIS for more information.			



Comments				Responses to Comments
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 673	Last: Quinn	First: Tom	
<p>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>I 70 expansion plan</p> <p>From: "Tom Quinn"</p> <p>Date: Fri, October 31, 2014 9:47 am</p> <p>To: contactus@i-70east.com</p> <p>Priority: Normal</p>				
<p>A</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have been on the edge of this issue, reading newspaper reports and scanning online information. As a result of those reviews I did not feel that the planned 10 lane expansion was well explained; the northern loop option did not seem to be seriously explored; nor were the concerns of community members addressed in any meaningful way.</p> <p>I just read the APA Peer Review report, dated Oct 15, 2014. That report solidified my impressions and uneasiness with the project as currently drafted. Here are excerpts from that well written and concise report:</p> <p>The current CDOT plan "Lacks a systemic, longterm perspective."</p> <p>"There appears to be little accomplished in the I-70 corridor planning process to develop and support a carefully thought-out multimodal strategy."</p> <p>"The preferred alternative cross section is wider than a football field is long. It would maximize rather than minimize impact on the abutting Environmental Justice neighborhoods."</p> <p>"Was highway induced development accounted for by CDOT and Atkins? The answer is no."</p> <p>"Common sense suggests that there will be a serious bottleneck for westbound traffic created by having the 10-lane section of I-70 transition down to 6 lanes to the west of the project."</p> <p>"As the project sponsor, CDOT is understandably pushing hard to move a project forward."</p>				<p>A</p> <p>News reports cannot be as comprehensive as the documents. For complete information, please refer to the appropriate sections of the Final EIS.</p> <p>For information on CDOT’s use of the American Planning Association’s Peer Review, please see GEN4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on congestion along I-70, west of I-25, please see TRANS4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on CDOT’s public outreach, please see OUT1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>
<p>B</p> <p>If we are to spend over a billion dollars on this massive project, it certainly should be tied to a regional transportation plan and include socio-cultural effects. Perhaps CDOT and others are pushing too hard to make this happen come hell or high water, ignoring or downplaying critical aspects that deserve attention. At this time it would be unwise to proceed with the 10-lane expansion. I am convinced that moving forward with that plan now would likely result in downstream negative results and substantial community backlash.</p> <p>Tom Quinn</p>				<p>B</p> <p>Pursuant to NEPA, the EIS takes into account regional transportation planning, reasonable and foreseeable future projects, and socio-cultural effects. For information on the need for 10 lanes, please see GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>The alternatives being evaluated were developed to avoid some impacts, minimize others, and mitigate the remaining impacts that could not be avoided or minimized. For information on all impacts and mitigation, please see Chapter 5, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation, of the Final EIS.</p>



*This page intentionally left blank.*

**R**





*This page intentionally left blank.*

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 698	Last:	First: Rachel		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b> <b>From:</b> "Rachel" <b>Date:</b> Fri, October 31, 2014 11:29 am <b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>) <b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Rachel</p> <div><div><div>A</div><div></div></div><div><div>B</div><div></div></div></div> <p>comment_topic: Environmental Justice,Financing,Property Impacts comments: The expansion of I-70 needs to take into account whether the money for the project is worth the trouble. Putting people out of homes, small, family owned businesses out of business and affecting young children. I urge our leaders to look at ALL options for the people of Denver and choose what is best for them, not the pockets of a company so their CEO can go buy his 3rd vacation home. It is time the average Joe is put first!</p>				<div><div><div>A</div><div></div></div><div><div>B</div><div></div></div></div> <p>All alternative require property acquisition, including No-Action. The viaduct’s deteriorating structural conditions are a safety issue. For information on the Preferred Alternative’s property impacts and displacement of residents, please see PROP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>The project followed a rigorous and exhaustive alternatives analysis that considered the full range of alternatives. For information on alternatives considered, please see ALT2 and ALT3 and TRANS1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments															
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 245	Last: Rangel	First: Maria																
<div>  <p><b>ANTEPROYECTO DEL INFORME DE IMPACTO AMBIENTAL SUPLEMENTARIO DE LA I-70 ESTE</b></p> <p>Puede presentar sus comentarios a la dirección que se encuentra debajo o en el sitio web de la I-70 Este (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) hasta el 31 de octubre del 2014.</p> <p>Se solicitan los comentarios del público de acuerdo con lo dispuesto por la Ley de Política Ambiental Nacional, 42 Código de los Estados Unidos 4321, et seq. Todos los comentarios presentados por escrito durante el período de comentarios serán considerados durante la preparación del Informe de Impacto Ambiental (EIS abreviación en inglés) Final. La información que proporcione sobre su domicilio privado con sus comentario es voluntario y protegido en conformidad con la Ley de Privacidad. La información de su domicilio privado no se publicará en el EIS Final o para cualquier otro propósito, a menos que sea requerido por ley. Sin embargo, su información de domicilio privado se utilizará para incluirlo en la lista de correos que usamos para enviar avisos futuros sobre el proyecto.</p> <p>Fecha: 09-14 ¿Desearía ser incluido en la lista de correos del EIS de la I-70Este? <input type="checkbox"/> Si <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Nombre (obligatorio): Maria Rangel</p> <p>Organización:</p> <p>Domicilio (obligatorio):</p> <p>Ciudad/Estado/Código:</p> <p>Email:</p> <p>¿Sus comentarios aplican a cualquiera de los temas listados a continuación? Circule lo que le interesa:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Calidad del Aire</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Justicia ambiental</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Financiamiento</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Materiales peligrosos</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Histórico</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carriles administrados</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ruido</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Impactos a propiedades</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Swansea Elementary</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Visual</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Alternativa preferida preliminarmente identificada</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tráfico de camiones</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Otros</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Favor de escribir legible sus comentarios sobre el Anteproyecto del EIS Suplementario a continuación.</p> <p>A <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Apollamos por esta Cabierta que se ve muy Uiena</span></p> <p>****SI NECESITA MAS ESPACIO CONTINUE AL REVERSO****</p> <p>Puede entregar esta forma a un miembro del equipo del proyecto o por correo/e-mail hasta el 14 de octubre del 2014, al:  I-70 East EIS Team  Colorado Department of Transportation  2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222  Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p>  </div>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Calidad del Aire	<input type="checkbox"/> Justicia ambiental	<input type="checkbox"/> Financiamiento	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Materiales peligrosos	<input type="checkbox"/> Histórico	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carriles administrados	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ruido	<input type="checkbox"/> Impactos a propiedades	<input type="checkbox"/> Swansea Elementary	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual	<input type="checkbox"/> Alternativa preferida preliminarmente identificada	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tráfico de camiones	<input type="checkbox"/> Otros			<p><b>A</b> Comentario tomado en cuenta.</p> <div> <p>The English translation of this comment and the response is on the following page.</p> <p>La traducción al inglés de este comentario y su respuesta se encuentra en la siguiente página.</p> </div>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Calidad del Aire	<input type="checkbox"/> Justicia ambiental	<input type="checkbox"/> Financiamiento	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Materiales peligrosos	<input type="checkbox"/> Histórico															
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carriles administrados	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ruido	<input type="checkbox"/> Impactos a propiedades	<input type="checkbox"/> Swansea Elementary	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual															
<input type="checkbox"/> Alternativa preferida preliminarmente identificada	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tráfico de camiones	<input type="checkbox"/> Otros																	



Comments				Responses to Comments															
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 245	Last: Rangel	First: Maria															
<div><div><div></div><div><p>Date: _____ Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p><p>Name (required): <u>Maria Rangel</u></p><p>Organization: _____</p><p>Address (required): _____</p><p>City/State/Zip: _____</p><p>Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p><table><tr><td>Air quality</td><td>Environmental justice</td><td>Financing</td><td>Hazardous materials</td><td>Historic</td></tr><tr><td>Managed lanes</td><td>Noise</td><td>Property impacts</td><td>Swansea Elementary</td><td>Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td>Truck traffic</td><td>Other</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.</p><div><div>A</div><div><p><u>Let's support this cover that looks very good.</u></p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p></div></div><div><div>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</div><div><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 31, 2014.</p><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><div><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 31, 2014, to:</p><p>I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p></div></div></div></div><div><div>A</div><div>Comment noted.</div></div></div></div> <div data-bbox="1401 808 1706 1203" data-label="Text"><p>This is a translation of the previous comment and response that was submitted in Spanish originally.</p><p>Ésta es una traducción del comentario anterior y su respuesta que se presentó originalmente en español.</p></div> <div data-bbox="136 1913 2971 1943" data-label="Page-Footer"><div>January 2016</div><div>C-811</div></div>					Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic	Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual	Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other		
Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic															
Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual															
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other																	

Comments				Responses to Comments
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 563	Last: Ranglos	First: Christopher James	
<p>Current Folder: <b>SDEIS Comments Responded to</b></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Public Comment I-70 East</p> <p><b>From:</b> "Chris Ranglos"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Thu, October 30, 2014 12:12 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>Please see attached PDF copy of comments regarding the I-70 East Project.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Christopher James Ranglos</p>				<p>The information in the cover letter is noted. Responses to specific comments are included on the following pages.</p>



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	563	Last:	Ranglos
				First:	Christopher James
October 30, 2014					
I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation contactus@I-70east.com					
I-70 East EIS Team,					
A	I would first and foremost like to congratulate your team on the I-70 East project. This is an immensely complex project that has been constructively and effectively analyzed over the past decade. There are many aspects of this project I find particularly beneficial and engaging that I believe you should be aware of.				
	A major strength of the I-70 East Environmental Impact Statement has been its determination in working with and including the public, local neighborhood residents, businesses and other stakeholders for more than a decade. I particularly appreciate the teams effort in working with the Swansea Elementary School and the inclination to help offset impacts the project is expected to have on the school. <i>The Partial Cover Lowered Proposal with Managed Lanes</i> seems to be the best option for this project as it solves the many issues with the imposing and decaying 50-year-old viaduct. The four-acre, landscaped cover over the highway by Swansea Elementary School provides not only a connective device, playgrounds, plazas, outdoor classrooms and community gardens, but also creates potential for a landmark unique to this area, and for transportation in the state of Colorado.				
B	Considering current congestion, future traffic forecasts on I-70 and the viaduct nearing the end of its useful life, I am in complete agreement that the <i>No Action alternative</i> should not be considered. I do have questions and concerns with the proposed action, however. In regard to the four-acre, landscaped cover on the highway, it appears to me that certain wildlife species would eventually inhabit this area. Have there been any studies to examine potential species that may eventually inhabit this area? If so, has the study revealed any prospective endangered species, or potential future habitat this area may ultimately provide for them?				
C	This is a major transportation project. This raises concern for the surrounding communities, more specifically during construction phases. How will communities including local businesses be affected in regard to noise levels and access to their homes? What time of year, and at what time during the day will the bulk of construction be happening? I would like to express particular concern for the air quality during time of construction, and the possible effects it may pose for the local communities. In particular, what effects will this and the increased noise levels have on Swansea Elementary School?				
Thank you for your time					
Best,					
Christopher James Ranglos					

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	485	Last:	Reiner
				First:	Adam
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Adam L. reiner"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Wed, October 29, 2014 10:08 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Adam L. reiner</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Historic,Managed Lanes,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic,Other</p> <p>comments: I am opposed to burying I-70 along its current route. The plan to re-route the highway through I-270 and I-76 is preferable, and will create a new boulevard along 40th Ave. that will revitalize the area around the Coliseum and Stock Show Complex.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 089	Last: Reinhardt	First: Richard	
Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to					
Welcome: contactus@i-70east.com					
Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM					
From: "Richard Reinhardt"					
Date: Mon, September 22, 2014 6:45 pm					
To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (more)					
Priority: Normal					
name: Richard Reinhardt					
comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Historic,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Visual,Truck Traffic					
A	comments: To Whom It May Concern: I oppose this proposal for a number of reasons, as a nearby resident, my family already suffers from the noise and pollution of I70. Widening the highway will only generate more filth in the air. I am aware of 11 schools in the EPA Impact Zone. I am concerned about years of ongoing commuter issues stemming from this project. I am concerned for my property values and those near me, especially in the hard hit neighborhoods of Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea. Given the impact that this project will have on those closest to it, I question why alternative solutions, especially those shown to shave as much as half the budget, have not been pursued further. Why has there been no study of a full re-route combining I-270 and I-76 in this SEIS? That solution seems to only save money, drive growth, resolve commuting issues, and open up depressed neighborhoods severed from the rest of Denver. Burying I-70 will result in maintenance costs far higher than a traditional surface road's in perpetuity. For all these reasons I implore my representatives, local leaders, and appointed officials to choose an alternate solution. Sincerely, Richard Reinhardt				
B					
C					
D					
E					
The highway cover reduces noise impacts in adjacent areas. The cover will directly contribute to improved air quality, resulting in PM10 concentrations that are lower at Swansea Elementary School and the surrounding area than they would be in the future without the cover (No-Action Alternative). For information on air quality and health in the project area, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
Detailed traffic modeling confirms the proposed improvements. For more information on why the project adds capacity to I-70, please see GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
CDOT recognizes that the project passes through environmental justice neighborhoods, and it has identified mitigation measures above and beyond standard mitigation measures to alleviate the impact on those neighborhoods. See Section 5.3, Environmental Justice, of the Final EIS for more information. For information on what CDOT plans to do to offset the project’s impacts, please see IMP1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
The project followed a rigorous and exhaustive alternatives analysis that considered more than 90 alternatives. For information on alternatives considered, please see ALT2 and ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					
Maintenance costs were estimated for each reasonable alternative using an annual unit cost for bridge, retaining walls, and pavement. The Reroute Alternative is not a reasonable alternative; therefore, maintenance costs were not developed or included in the Final EIS. For the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative, additional costs for the cover associated with the potential urban landscape, ventilation, fire, and life safety features were included. The annual maintenance costs for the three project alternatives analyzed in the Final EIS were estimated to be (in 2016 dollars): - No-Action Alternative = \$9.3 million - Revised Viaduct Alternative = \$16 million - Partial Cover Lowered Alternative = \$11.3 million For the Managed Lanes Option, the total costs for the operations and maintenance of the managed lanes are estimated to be approximately \$1.7 million a year in addition to the costs listed above. This cost includes equipment replacement, CDOT/HPTE staff, and back office support associated with the toll collection. For more information on maintenance costs of the reasonable alternatives studied in the Final EIS, please see Chapter 3, Summary of Project Alternatives of the Final EIS.					
The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.					



Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Public hearing transcript	Document Number:	265	Last:	Ribota	First:	Raymond
A	I've been living in Swansea for perhaps the last two years. I live just a couple blocks away from the highway near the corner of 47th and Thompson.						
	Once construction of the project begins, I will be affected because I will be perhaps one block closer to the highway. I'm concerned about the project, but I'm concerned about the present and the future of the project. I'm concerned how it's going to affect the neighborhood and the city and the community as a whole. I've noticed lots of residents are concerned now. It's going to affect themselves and the community as well, but I think it's very important and it's inherently clear that we need to also prepare for the future. Considering all of the different options that are available, all the different options that have been studied, EIS statements, the option that makes the most sense to me is the partially covered option. That's because it's the best compromise considering the environmental factors and the few options that are available at this point. I'm in favor because it corrects the problems that are already there without making a dramatic impact to the community.						
	As part of this project—as part of this option, I mean—I'm in favor of the 10-lane larger expansive highway option as well. And this is because this is the option that takes into consideration the growth of the neighborhood and the traffic and the growth of the city as well. It makes no sense to do any of the options without considering how much our traffic is going to increase, how much more the population of the area is going to increase and the traffic going around this particular section especially. The 10-lane option, the larger I-70 option, is the best option because it allows for growth while taking into consideration the community as a whole. I recognize that this particular area is a difficult environment to make it perfect. There's no such thing in this particular area. But the partially covered option resolves many of the problems and issues that are currently present.						
	It actually connects the two neighbors between Swansea and Elyria. That's one problem that's been existing for many, many years—that's connecting these two neighbors. It's perhaps one of the best options that resolves this problem. It connects the two neighbors. It provides safety. It provides a green option where people can actually connect together, people that can actually meet in the green park areas, which is an additional benefit that allows the two communities to be brought together. It also eliminates the—the partially covered 10-lane option allows traffic to pass through the neighborhood without making a dramatic impact as well. Traffic will not be stagnant. It will not be a parking lot allowing all those carbon gas emissions from vehicles to stay in the neighborhood and affect the residents and the community.						
	I also recognize that there might be some homes and people that might be displaced in this option. It is unfortunate, but the residents will be taken care of. And, honestly, this particular option, the partially covered option, is the one that will affect the residents the least. I recognize if the highway is created much smaller, it would be a smaller impact, but it would be a smaller impact for a short amount of time, which I think it makes no sense to do a smaller lane highway and years later have the same problem come up again where people, the city, residents, the community will have to come together again and decide what changes need to be done again because the amount of lanes is too small to take into consideration the amount of traffic that will be a part of this area of Denver in the next perhaps 20 years. It's best to plan for the City of Denver and this neighborhood and the residents long term. Instead of planning 20 years, let's plan 50 years, 60 years, even more.						
				A	Comment noted.		

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 021	Last: Rich	First: Sherri		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Sherri Rich"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Thu, September 4, 2014 5:02 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Sherri Rich</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Hazardous Materials,Noise,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Truck Traffic</p> <p>comments: I am writing to request that CDOT not continue with their plans to widen I-70. Widening the highway will continue to place the citizens of Globeville, Swansea and Elyria in a toxic environment that not only threatens the health of the entire community, but especially their children attending Swansea Elementary. You cannot seriously assert that simply placing a "cover" over the highway will fix the problem and then brazenly place the children's playground on top of the cover. I can guarantee none of the CDOT panel nor the city council members backing this plan would ever let their children or grandchildren attend a school in this location, yet they have determined it's all right for the underserved and pushed aside population of northeast Denver. In addition, there are a number of other concerns regarding this project that raise a red flag -- Public Private Partnership, toll lanes. a trench that will be flooded in heavy rains, a tunnel that will receive little sunlight and be iced over causing accidents</p>				<p><b>A</b> These concerns have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on public-private partnerships, please see FUND2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on drainage of the Preferred Alternative, please see IMP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on environmental justice considerations, please see EJ1, EJ2, and EJ3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on the benefits of the highway cover, please see PA1 and PA2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on the identification of Managed Lanes as the preferred operational option, please see PA7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	491	Last:	Rich	First:	Sherri
Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a>							
<a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">Welcome: contactus@i-70east.com</a>							
Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM							
From: "Sherri Rich"							
Date: Wed, October 29, 2014 12:07 pm							
To: webmastercc@i-70east.com ( <a href="#">more</a> )							
Priority: Normal							
name: Sherri Rich							
comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Historic,Noise,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Truck Traffic							
A	[	comments: We have the opportunity now to fix a mistake that was made over 50 years ago and instead do something that could benefit Denver on so many different levels - economically, ecologically, culturally, etc. We should have the hindsight to see the error that was made in the past and take the necessary steps to repair the damage that was done when I-70 was built through the heart of north Denver. I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 & I-270 alternative. Thank you!					

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 425	Last: Rickard	First: Sophia		
Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to					
Welcome: contactus@i-70east.com					
Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM					
From: "Sophia Rickard"					
Date: Mon, October 27, 2014 10:33 am					
To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (more)					
Priority: Normal					
name: Sophia Rickard					
comment_topic: Air Quality,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Historic,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Other					
<div><div>A</div><div>B</div><div>C</div><div>D</div></div>	comments: I am opposed to the widening of I-70 for several reasons. 1. More lanes do not improve traffic appreciably. All these lanes will make traffic a LITTLE better but at HUGE cost financially, to businesses and homes that currently exist, extra noise and air pollution and dredging up toxic waste. 2. I feel that we cannot justify paying so much (and possibly more later) when the Preliminarily identified alternative on I-76 is much less expensive and much less problematic. 3. Huge highways tear up the fabric of neighborhood. I do not think that a few links with a park/ playground renderings look deceptive to me. I have been in a park over a highway in Seattle and it is not as appealing as the sketch makes it look. The sketch does now show the sound impact, smell impact or the pollution that the children will inhale in such a location. 4. I am opposed to moving homes and businesses that are in the brink of thriving with our improving economy. It seems tragic to close these opportunities down. Please reconsider the Preliminarily Identified Alternative.				
<div><div>A</div>CDOT agrees that we can no longer just build more lanes to prevent congestion. In fact, that is a main reason the Department is proposing to make the new lanes on I-70 East managed or tolled lanes with congestion pricing. These managed lanes give CDOT the ability to manage congestion over time, providing the guarantee of a congestion-free ride even as highway volumes increase. Further, managed lanes can encourage carpooling and transit use and enable more reliable and efficient transit service.  The other concerns have adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on noise, please see IMP3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.  For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.  For information on encountering hazardous materials, please see IMP6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>					
<div><div>B</div>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>					
<div><div>C</div>Comment noted. For information on the Preferred Alternative highway cover, please see PA1 and PA2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.  The cover will directly contribute to improved air quality, resulting in PM10 concentrations that are lower at Swansea Elementary School and the surrounding area than they would be in the future without the cover (No-Action Alternative). For information on air quality near the cover, please see AQ5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>					
<div><div>D</div>All alternatives require property acquisition including No-Action. For information on the Preferred Alternative’s property impacts and displacement of residents, please see PROP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>					

Comments					Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 321	Last: Rickman	First: Bill		
<div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div>						
<div>OPINION I-70 EXPANSION vs. REROUTE</div> <div><div>From: "Bill Rickman"</div><div>Date: Mon, October 13, 2014 1:30 pm</div><div>To: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div><div>Priority: Normal</div></div>						
<div>To Whom it may concern:</div>						
A	<div>I am writing to provide my input, both personally and professionally about the proposed project. I am in support to the alternative route using I-76 and 270, and against the route using the existing I-70 corridor. I, along with a number of Realtors have followed the conversation for a couple of years. I was originally ok with the decision to lower I-70 and keep the current route, but after reading the project specifics and talking to a variety of business and real estate professionals, I now support the alternative option to reroute the highway.</div>					
B	<div><div>1. Driving that section, it is apparent that the highway was jammed into that space to begin with and was a bad idea. Over the years sentiment toward core urban neighborhoods has changed and to lower the highway, widen it to 12 lanes, then in a "feel good" proposal to placate neighborhood activists with a "connecting park" is a joke. It will no more connect those two sides of a very wide highway than if you left it the way it is now.</div></div>					
	<div><div>2. I looked at the drainage proposal and am reminded of I-25 and Alameda. Now after years and millions of dollars in new drainage, it still fills with water when storms come through. The same thing will happen here by building a longer "canal". The size of the drainage pipes, where they will drain with mag Chloride and dirt, and the lack of sun.. ever. in that trench will never be solved. The first big storm after construction is completed will be a nightmare with stranded cars, motorists, and debris. Look for someone to drown in the event.</div></div>					
C	<div><div>3. The neighborhoods both north and south of the "canal" will continue to be negatively effected by the noise, pollution, and congestion that it experiences today. Widening the highway to 12 lanes will destroy many more low income houses and devastate the school on the north side of the highway. The plan shows a northside service road that will be clogged 24/7 creating as much havoc as the elevated does now. It also puts the school and its students at the same grade as semis and heavy traffic. For some reason (I think poor design) all Denver freeways seem to have way too many exits and on-ramps. A freeway is not a street with intersections every few hundred yards. This redesign will only make that situation worse.</div></div>					
<div><div>A</div><div>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q; for information on the cover, please see PA1 and PA2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>						
<div><div>B</div><div>Drainage concerns are adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on drainage of the Preferred Alternative, please see IMP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>						
<div><div>C</div><div>The highway cover reduces noise impacts in adjacent areas. The cover will directly contribute to improved air quality, resulting in PM10 concentrations that are lower at Swansea Elementary School and the surrounding area than they would be in the future without the cover (No-Action Alternative). The north frontage road no longer exists between the school and the cover with the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIS. Other concerns have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS, as well. For information on project mitigation measures, please see IMP1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>						
<div><div>For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>						
<div><div>For information on the need for 10 lanes, please see GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>						
<div><div>For information on mitigation for Swansea Elementary School, please see IMP4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>						

Comments				Responses to Comments				
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	321	Last:	Rickman	First:	Bill	
D	4. That covers east of I-25. West of I-25, even though will be at or around grade, if increased to 12 lanes will further split and destroy the enormous economic growth and resurgence of all of NW Denver. As a Realtor based in the Tennyson Street Shopping and Arts District and a long time resident of NW Denver, I can tell you it will negatively impact the neighborhoods from Chaffee Park and Regis University to Berkeley Lake and Willis Case Golf Course. I sat on the Citizens Advisory Commission for the Berkeley Park Master Plan and noise, space, and pollution were all big topics and challenges to that plan. If the existing highway path is redeveloped over time with a boulevard that actually does connect neighborhoods north and south of its current path, the economic benefits will far outweigh any benefits of leaving the highway where it is.					D	CDOT has no current or future plans to widen I-70 west of the I-25/I-70 interchange in Denver. For information on I-70 west of I-25, please see TRANS4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.	
	E	5. If the highway were rerouted to I-76 and 270 it would build on land already owned by CDOT, would go through areas that will never develop like the city neighborhoods that have already developed in the urban neighborhoods where the highway currently runs, there will be less infrastructure to move, and it will sacrifice fewer existing buildings and homes. You will never convince me that the cost for the alternative route will be more expensive.					E	The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q. While there is research that shows that certain pavements produce slightly lower noise levels, they are not a practical noise reduction strategy because road conditions can change or deteriorate over time, gradually lessening their ability to reduce noise.
		F	I believe the plan promoted by the administration and CDOT is more politically motivated than design and engineering likes to suggest. As a side note, I have become increasingly sensitive to freeway noise and believe any design should consider road materials that quiet the traffic, not make it scream. After driving in a number of states with a variety of freeway surfaces, it occurs to me that other states are doing a far better job. Highways within metro areas should be required to use quieting materials to pave freeways.					F
Thanks for allowing me to provide my input.								
Bill Rickman, Managing Broker								



Comments				Responses to Comments
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 034	Last: Riecke	First: John	
<div>Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to</div> <div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div> <div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div> <div>From: "John Riecke"</div> <div>Date: Tue, September 9, 2014 4:14 pm</div> <div>To: <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (more)</div> <div>Priority: Normal</div> <div><div>A</div><div>name: John Riecke</div><div>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Visual,Truck Traffic</div><div>comments: Hello. I am completely surprised that CDOT is pushing to triple the width of the freeway through the middle of Denver while spending over a billion dollars to bury it in the hopes that the people living next to the road will give their blessing. We should do a full study on the re-route around Denver following the I-270/I-76 route, given that it impacts less neighborhoods and schools, given that the right-of-way is already available (if the wide shoulders between the roads and the fence are to be believed) and given that the goal shouldn't be to merely move more cars, but to do it in a way that serves a greater purpose. Consolidating highways and allowing the neighborhoods of north Denver to heal would provide more economic and social value than burying the highway at greater cost. It also makes no sense to widen a freeway immediately adjacent to a soon-to-be-completed rail line that will draw off many commuters that today use the highway.</div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project's purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div><div>The commuter rail is included in the traffic model. For information on multi-modal considerations, please see TRANS1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>





Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 557	Last: Rinehart	First: Ruth		
<div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div> <div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div> <div><div>From: "Ruth Rinehart"</div><div>Date: Thu, October 30, 2014 10:58 am</div><div>To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (more)</div><div>Priority: Normal</div></div> <div><div>A</div><div>name: Ruth Rinehart</div><div>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Hazardous Materials,Historic,Noise,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Truck Traffic</div><div>comments: The Globeville, Elyria and Swansea communities have suffered enough. It is urgent that the DOT take the time to ensure the solutions requested in this petition. These communities deserve this, after the 50 years of disruption they have already suffered. Denver area faith leaders request that the Colorado Department of Transportation develop a solution that listens to the needs and wants of those who live in these neighborhoods. We seek an outcome that does not displace homes, families, or businesses in these neighborhoods.We seek a solution that demonstrably improves the health and wellness of residents beyond conditions that exist today that is, a solution that results in measurably better health conditions for residents, school children, workers and visitors to these neighborhoods. We request a solution that improves mobility and accessibility of residents of these neighborhoods, that does not continue to rely on fossil fuel technology, and provides instead new investments in transit, sidewalk completion, separation of railways, and bicycle connections. We request a solution that focuses foremost on improved connectivity within these neighborhoods and repairing the damage caused by locating I-70 here more than 50 years ago. We strongly affirm that investing in making these communities more complete, more vibrant, and healthier should be the city and state's priority, not damaging them further through this misguided proposal.</div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div>These concerns have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on CDOT’s outreach to the public and other stakeholders, please see OUT1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div><div>For information on the Preferred Alternative’s property impacts and displacement of residents, please see PROP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div><div>For information on alternatives that remove I-70 East from its current alignment, please see ALT2 and ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div><div>For information on the No-Action Alternative, please see ALT1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div><div>For information on the need to widen the highway, please see GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div><div>For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div><div>For information on the cover and connectivity, please see PA1, PA2, and PA9 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div><div>For information on multi-modal considerations, including walking and biking, please see TRANS1 and TRANS2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 231	Last: Rivet	First: Clint		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Clint" <b>Date:</b> Sat, October 11, 2014 4:04 pm <b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>) <b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Clint</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Financing,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts</p> <p>comments: After reading various sections of your study I feel obligated to comment. I am a taxpayer and regularly use the relevant sections of I-70. I also work for a engineering and construction company with significant infrastructure experience. With this background I feel responsible to request you look at discontinuing this alternative as I believe 1) the cost estimated is too high and value low, 2) impact on nieghborhoods and families massively detrimental, and 3) environmental risks high. I believe you will significantly overrun on cost for this project as presented and again the return will be too low. I implore you too consider the proposed I-76 reroute that may have lower costs and clearly more value to improving the community. Thank you for your fair consideration</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>CDOT cost estimates were completed using standard procedures and unit prices for the anticipated work that would be required. The estimates have been reviewed and confirmed by outside agencies. For information on project mitigation measures, please see IMP1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	

Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	724	Last:	Roberts	First:	Roberta

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	109	Last:	Roberts
				First:	Shane
<p>Current Folder: <b>SDEIS Comments Responded to</b></p> <p><b>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></b></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b> <b>From:</b> "Shane Roberts" <b>Date:</b> Tue, September 23, 2014 4:01 pm <b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>) <b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Shane Roberts</p> <div><div>A</div><div><div>comment_topic: Managed Lanes,Other</div><div>comments: - No on Toll Lanes, HOV would be better - (optimistically) Plan to run future Light Rail out to DIA along similar route?</div></div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div><div>CDOT is proposing to make the new lanes on I-70 East managed with congestion pricing to provide greater flexibility. These managed lanes give CDOT the ability to manage congestion over time, providing the guarantee of a congestion-free ride even as highway volumes increase. HOV will also be accommodated in the managed lanes. For information on the identification of Managed Lanes as the preferred operational option, please see PA7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div></div> <p>RTD’s commuter rail line to DIA runs roughly parallel to the highway between York Street and Peña Boulevard. Ridership for that rail line is included in the travel models used for the I-70 East analysis.</p>	



Comments				Responses to Comments																
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 236	Last: Robertson	First: Richard																	
<div><p><b>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</b></p><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 31, 2014.</p><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Date: <u>OCT. 4, 2014</u> Would you like to be included on the mailing list? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p><p>Name (required): <u>RICHARD ROBERTSON</u></p><p>Organization: _____</p><p>Address (required): _____</p><p>City/State/Zip: _____</p><p>Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle/select all that apply:</p><table border="0"><tr><td><input type="radio"/> Air quality</td><td><input checked="" type="radio"/> Environmental justice</td><td><input checked="" type="radio"/> Financing</td><td><input type="radio"/> Hazardous materials</td><td><input type="radio"/> Historic</td></tr><tr><td><input type="radio"/> Managed lanes</td><td><input type="radio"/> Noise</td><td><input checked="" type="radio"/> Property impacts</td><td><input type="radio"/> Swansea Elementary</td><td><input type="radio"/> Visual</td></tr><tr><td><input checked="" type="radio"/> Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td><input type="radio"/> Truck traffic</td><td><input type="radio"/> Other</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below</p><p><u>I CANNOT PRINT LEGIBLY</u> <u>FOR MORE THAN A FEW LINES,</u> <u>SO I HAVE TYPED ON THE ATTACHED</u> <u>SHEET. THANK YOU.</u></p><p><u>R. Robertson</u></p><p>****Continue on back for more space****</p><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 31, 2014, to: I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222</p><div></div></div>					<input type="radio"/> Air quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Environmental justice	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Financing	<input type="radio"/> Hazardous materials	<input type="radio"/> Historic	<input type="radio"/> Managed lanes	<input type="radio"/> Noise	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Property impacts	<input type="radio"/> Swansea Elementary	<input type="radio"/> Visual	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Preliminary identified preferred alternative	<input type="radio"/> Truck traffic	<input type="radio"/> Other			<div>The information in the cover letter is noted. Responses to specific comments are included on the following pages.</div>
<input type="radio"/> Air quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Environmental justice	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Financing	<input type="radio"/> Hazardous materials	<input type="radio"/> Historic																
<input type="radio"/> Managed lanes	<input type="radio"/> Noise	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Property impacts	<input type="radio"/> Swansea Elementary	<input type="radio"/> Visual																
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Preliminary identified preferred alternative	<input type="radio"/> Truck traffic	<input type="radio"/> Other																		





Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	236	Last:	Robertson
				First:	Richard
<div><div><div>DEAR SUE,</div><div><div>A</div><div><p>To widen the I-70 wound across North Denver and dig it in would cost too much in every way I can imagine. It is a mistake based on outmoded models of traffic management. Denver needs this section of highway less and less as traffic declines. I think making it bigger will only make it worse.</p><p>Even with the bandage across part of it, the new I-70 East would wipe out more land around it and would further isolate and insult the people living north of it. They deserve better, and Denver can do better than to chase a mistake like this.</p><p>Denver has matured greatly since the 1970s, when I and the rest of the construction industry had to scramble, trying to keep up with each boom and bust. We must continue to show we know how to plan for a world different than today's. San Francisco has done well without the Embarcadero; other cities are removing their highways and benefiting from it. Denver should not be gouging its outmoded highway wider and deeper.</p><p>Ever since I could use I-76 and I-270, I have preferred that route to slogging through North Denver on I-70. Diverting I-70 past the city makes more sense. It would be far less expensive and disruptive, and it would allow Denver to continue developing and changing.</p><div><div>Yours Truly,</div><div>R. Robertson</div></div></div></div></div></div>					
<div><div><div>A</div><div><p>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project's purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p><p>Growth and associated construction will continue to be somewhat cyclical in nature, and the models are updated accordingly for the region based on anticipated trends. For information on how the traffic forecasting model was determined for this project, future driving trends, Managed Lanes and widening the highway, please see TRANS5, TRANS 11, PA7, and GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p></div></div></div>					

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	211	Last:	Robins
			First:	Jody	
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Reroute I-70 rather than bury</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Jody Robins" <b>Date:</b> Tue, October 7, 2014 6:43 am <b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a> <b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <div><div>A</div><div><p>I lived in Houston when Hwy 59 was moved below grade. While it does look better from several blocks away, it did absolutely nothing to reconnect the neighborhoods on either side of the highway. I-70 should be rerouted onto I-76 to truly allow these neighborhoods to thrive.</p><p>-- Jody Robins</p></div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div><p>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p></div></div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 488	Last: Robinson	First: Matt		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b> <b>From:</b> "Matt Robinson" <b>Date:</b> Wed, October 29, 2014 11:40 am <b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>) <b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Matt Robinson</p> <p>comment_topic: Environmental Justice,Financing,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary,Other comments: I am compelled to speak out against CDOT forcing the community to simply accept this proposal. It's littered with bad ideas. I am concerned about how much this will cost the city and it's taxpayers, and I have serious concerns about public-private partnership approach. I wish CDOT would take the reroute alternative (I-270, I-76) seriously. I believe that CDOT needs to do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-76. Denver is evolving into a multi-modal city that doesn't need bigger/wider highways, but rather, needs 21st century solutions to the transportation challenges of the future. You are taking advantage of the weakest communities among us, Elyria, Swansea and Globeville. Our neighbors in these communities are the most vulnerable, with little to no money, little political influence, and little to no voice in this matter. You hold meetings with them and pretend to listen. This is shameful!</p>				<p><b>A</b> These concerns have been addressed in the Final EIS. For information on the multi-model forms of transportation investigated, please see TRANS1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on environmental justice considerations, please see EJ1, EJ2, and EJ3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on CDOT’s public involvement, please see OUT1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on the need to widen the highway, please see GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on traffic forecasting and future driving trends, please see TRANS5 and TRANS11 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	







Comments				Responses to Comments																						
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	841	Last:	Rodarte	First:	Julian																			
<div><div>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</div><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 14, 2014.</p><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Date: <u>10/18/14</u> Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p><p>Name (required): <u>Julian Rodarte</u></p><p>Organization: _____</p><p>Address (required): _____</p><p>City/State/Zip: _____</p><p>Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p><table border="0"><tr><td><u>Air quality</u></td><td>Environmental justice</td><td>Financing</td><td>Hazardous materials</td><td>Historic</td></tr><tr><td>Managed lanes</td><td><u>Noise</u></td><td><u>Property impacts</u></td><td>Swansea Elementary</td><td>Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td>Truck traffic</td><td>Other</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.</p><div><div>A</div><div><p><u>Julian Rodarte</u></p><p><u>y NO kiero el freeway</u></p><p><u>ase mucho ruido</u></p></div></div><p>****CONTINUE ON BACK FOR MORE SPACE****</p><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 14, 2014, to:</p><p>I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p></div>								<u>Air quality</u>	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic	Managed lanes	<u>Noise</u>	<u>Property impacts</u>	Swansea Elementary	Visual	Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other			<div><div>A</div><p>Para obtener información sobre la forma en que el ruido del tráfico se reducirá al máximo después de la construcción, consulte la sección IMP3 de las Respuestas y Comentarios Recibidos con Frecuencia del Anteproyecto del EIS Suplementario, ubicado en la Parte 1 del Anexo Q.</p></div>			
<u>Air quality</u>	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic																						
Managed lanes	<u>Noise</u>	<u>Property impacts</u>	Swansea Elementary	Visual																						
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other																								

The English translation of this comment and the response is on the following page.

La traducción al inglés de este comentario y su respuesta se encuentra en la siguiente página.



Comments				Responses to Comments																			
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	841	Last:	Rodarte	First:	Julian																
<div><div><b>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</b><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by <b>October 31, 2014</b>.</p></div><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Date: <u>10-18-14</u> Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p><p>Name (required): <u>Julian Rodarte</u></p><p>Organization: _____</p><p>Address (required): _____</p><p>City/State/Zip: _____</p><p>Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p><table><tr><td>Air quality</td><td>Environmental justice</td><td>Financing</td><td>Hazardous materials</td><td>Historic</td></tr><tr><td>Managed lanes</td><td>Noise</td><td>Property impacts</td><td>Swansea Elementary</td><td>Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td>Truck traffic</td><td>Other</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table><p><b>A</b> <u>I do not want the freeway, it makes too much noise</u></p><p>****CONTINUE ON BACK FOR MORE SPACE****</p><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by <b>October 31, 2014</b>, to:</p><p>I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p><div></div></div>								Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic	Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual	Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other			<p><b>A</b> Noise concerns have been addressed in the Final EIS. For information on how traffic noise will be minimized after construction, please see IMP3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <div><p>This is a translation of the previous comment and response that was submitted in Spanish originally.</p><p>Esta es una traducción del comentario anterior y su respuesta que se presentó originalmente en español.</p></div>
Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic																			
Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual																			
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other																					



Comments				Responses to Comments																
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 875	Last: Rodarte	First: Zenaida																	
<div><div><p><b>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</b></p><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 14, 2014.</p></div><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Date: <u>10/18/14</u> Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Name (required): <u>Zenaida Rodarte</u> Organization: _____ Address (required): _____ City/State/Zip: _____ Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p><table><tr><td><u>Air quality</u></td><td>Environmental justice</td><td><u>Financing</u></td><td>Hazardous materials</td><td>Historic</td></tr><tr><td>Managed lanes</td><td><u>Noise</u></td><td>Property impacts</td><td>Swansea Elementary</td><td>Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td>Truck traffic</td><td>Other</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.</p><div><div>A</div><div><p>I dont want the freeway there because it smells bad and to much noise house value go down.</p></div></div><p>****CONTINUE ON BACK FOR MORE SPACE****</p><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 14, 2014, to: I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p><div></div></div>					<u>Air quality</u>	Environmental justice	<u>Financing</u>	Hazardous materials	Historic	Managed lanes	<u>Noise</u>	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual	Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other			<div><div>A</div><div>Noise and air quality are adequately addressed in the Final EIS; please see IMP3 and AQ3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>
<u>Air quality</u>	Environmental justice	<u>Financing</u>	Hazardous materials	Historic																
Managed lanes	<u>Noise</u>	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual																
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other																		

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Public hearing transcript		Document Number: 301	Last: Rodela	First: Jackie	
A		Shame on you, for one thing, to put this the last on your list, you know. And if you would have been up-to-date in fixing it, we wouldn't be in this predicament.			
B		Second of all, I went to Globeville. I moved to Globeville in '92. I went to the schools there. Instead of putting in \$1.1 billion on a freeway, you should be dedicating that to the schools. Look at how sad this is how this cafeteria and auditorium has to be shared. That's sad to me, very sad.			
C		Second of all—third of all, I moved here three years ago, and I'll be damned if you're moving me out. I will live there and I will die in that home. And that's all I have to say.			





January 2016 C-835






Comments				Responses to Comments																				
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	244	Last:	Rodriguez	First:	Elvia																	
<div><p>Date: _____ Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p><p>Name (required): <u>Elvia Rodriguez</u></p><p>Organization: _____</p><p>Address (required): _____</p><p>City/State/Zip: _____</p><p>Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p><table border="0"><tr><td>Air quality</td><td>Environmental justice</td><td>Financing</td><td>Hazardous materials</td><td>Historic</td></tr><tr><td>Managed lanes</td><td>Noise</td><td>Property impacts</td><td>Swansea Elementary</td><td>Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td>Truck traffic</td><td>Other</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.</p><div><div>A</div><div><p>I support the project, the cover alternative.</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p><p>_____</p></div></div><div><div>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</div><div><p>Please submit comments to the address below</p><p>or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 31, 2014.</p></div><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 31, 2014, to:</p><p>I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p></div></div>								Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic	Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual	Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other			<div><div>A</div><div>Comment noted.</div></div> <div><div>This is a translation of the previous comment and response that was submitted in Spanish originally.</div><div>Ésta es una traducción del comentario anterior y su respuesta que se presentó originalmente en español.</div></div>	
Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic																				
Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual																				
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other																						



Comments				Responses to Comments															
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 174	Last: Rodriguez	First: Isidro																
<div><div><div><div><div><div></div><div>ANTEPROYECTO DEL INFORME DE IMPACTO AMBIENTAL SUPLEMENTARIO DE LA I-70 ESTE</div><div>Puede presentar sus comentarios a la dirección que se encuentra debajo o en el sitio web de la I-70 Este (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) hasta el 31 de octubre del 2014.</div></div></div><div><p>Se solicitan los comentarios del público de acuerdo con lo dispuesto por la Ley de Política Ambiental Nacional, 42 Código de los Estados Unidos 4321, et seq. Todos los comentarios presentados por escrito durante el período de comentarios serán considerados durante la preparación del Informe de Impacto Ambiental (EIS abreviación en inglés) Final. La información que proporcione sobre su domicilio privado con sus comentario es voluntario y protegido en conformidad con la Ley de Privacidad. La información de su domicilio privado no se publicará en el EIS Final o para cualquier otro propósito, a menos que sea requerido por ley. Sin embargo, su información de domicilio privado se utilizará para incluirlo en la lista de correos que usamos para enviar avisos futuros sobre el proyecto.</p><p>Fecha: <u>9-25-14</u> ¿Desearía ser incluido en la lista de correos del EIS de la I-70Este? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sí <input type="checkbox"/> No</p><p>Nombre (obligatorio): <u>Isidro Rodriguez</u></p><p>Organización: _____</p><p>Domicilio (obligatorio) _____</p><p>Ciudad/Estado/Código _____</p><p>Email: _____</p><p>¿Sus comentarios aplican a cualquiera de los temas listados a continuación? Circule lo que le interesa:</p><table><tr><td>Calidad del Aire</td><td>Justicia ambiental</td><td>Financiamiento</td><td>Materiales peligrosos</td><td>Histórico</td></tr><tr><td>Carriles administrados</td><td>Ruido</td><td>Impactos a propiedades</td><td>Swansea Elementary</td><td>Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Alternativa preferida preliminarmente identificada</td><td>Tráfico de camiones</td><td>Otros</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table><p>Favor de escribir legible sus comentarios sobre el Anteproyecto del EIS Suplementario a continuación.</p><div><div>A</div><div><p>Nosotros estamos preocupados por como la construcción va a impactar la calidad de aire en nuestra area. Asi como el ruido y cual va ser el impacto a la propiedad. Lo mas preocupante es cuando el puente es destruido, el poco es el problema si causa molestias para respirar.</p></div></div><p>Puede entregar esta forma a un miembro del equipo del proyecto o por correo/e-mail hasta el 31 de octubre del 2014, al:</p><p>I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p><div></div></div></div></div></div>				Calidad del Aire	Justicia ambiental	Financiamiento	Materiales peligrosos	Histórico	Carriles administrados	Ruido	Impactos a propiedades	Swansea Elementary	Visual	Alternativa preferida preliminarmente identificada	Tráfico de camiones	Otros			<div><div>A</div><div><p>Para obtener información sobre la calidad del aire, consulte las secciones AQ3, AQ5, AQ6 y AQ7 de las Respuestas y Comentarios Recibidos con Frecuencia del Anteproyecto del EIS Suplementario, ubicado en la Parte 1 del Anexo Q. Para obtener información sobre la forma en que se atenuará el ruido durante la construcción, consulte la sección IMP8 de las Respuestas y Comentarios Recibidos con Frecuencia del Anteproyecto del EIS Suplementario, ubicado en la Parte 1 del Anexo Q. Para obtener información sobre la forma en que se atenuará la fuga de polvo durante la construcción, consulte la sección IMP7 de las Respuestas y Comentarios Recibidos con Frecuencia del Anteproyecto del EIS Suplementario, ubicado en la Parte 1 del Anexo Q.</p></div></div> <div><div></div><div><p>The English translation of this comment and the response is on the following page.</p><p>La traducción al inglés de este comentario y su respuesta se encuentra en la siguiente página.</p></div></div>
Calidad del Aire	Justicia ambiental	Financiamiento	Materiales peligrosos	Histórico															
Carriles administrados	Ruido	Impactos a propiedades	Swansea Elementary	Visual															
Alternativa preferida preliminarmente identificada	Tráfico de camiones	Otros																	





Comments				Responses to Comments																
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	174	Last:	Rodriguez	First:	Isidro													
<div><div><b>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</b><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by <b>October 31, 2014.</b></p></div><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Date: <u>9-25-14</u> Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p><p>Name (required): <u>Isidro Rodriguez</u></p><p>Organization: _____</p><p>Address (required): _____</p><p>City/State/Zip: _____</p><p>Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p><table><tr><td>Air quality</td><td>Environmental justice</td><td>Financing Hazardous materials</td><td>Historic</td></tr><tr><td>Managed lanes</td><td>Noise</td><td>Property impacts</td><td>Swansea Elementary Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td>Truck traffic</td><td>Other</td><td></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.</p><div><div>A</div><div><p>We are worry on how the construction is going to impact the air quality in our area. As well as the noise and what is going to be the impact to properties. The most worrisome [issue] is when the bridge gets demolished, the dust is the problem if it causes trouble breathing.</p><p>*****CONTINUE ON BACK FOR MORE SPACE*****</p></div></div><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 31, 2014, to:</p><div><div>I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div><div></div></div></div>								Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing Hazardous materials	Historic	Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary Visual	Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other		<div><div>A</div><div><p>These concerns are adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on air quality , please see AQ3, AQ5, AQ6, and AQ7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q. For information on mitigating noise during construction, please see IMP8 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q. For information on mitigating fugitive dust during construction, please see IMP7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p></div></div> <div><p>This is a translation of the previous comment and response that was submitted in Spanish originally.</p><p>Esta es una traducción del comentario anterior y su respuesta que se presentó originalmente en español.</p></div>
Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing Hazardous materials	Historic																	
Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary Visual																	
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	Other																		

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	501	Last:	Rome
			First:	Jerry	
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</p> <p><b>From:</b> "Jerry Rome"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Wed, October 29, 2014 12:26 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Jerry Rome</p> <p><b>A</b>  comment_topic: Other comments: I am requesting that CDOT perform a supplemental EIS for I-70 using the I-76 &amp; I-270 alternative.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 178	Last: Rome	First: Susan		
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Susan Rome"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Sat, September 27, 2014 3:17 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Susan Rome</p> <div><div>A</div><div><p>comment_topic: Historic,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Property Impacts</p><p>comments: I urge you to consider the I-270/I-76 Reroute. These highways are already built, not heavily used and do not pass through any residential areas. I urge CDOT do an SEIS on the full re-route that includes both I-270 and I-6 As a north Denver resident, taxpayer and parks and recreation user, I am extremely concerned about the eventual and inevitable impact of this project on the west side of I 25. The Berkley Lake park was just recently renovated and many families enjoy both the park and Willis Case golf course. I feel I-70 expansion would have a very negative impact on the quality of life in North Denver which is currently undergoing quite a revitalization and boom. Why do want to stop that by adding more noise, traffic and pollution?</p></div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div><p>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p><p>There are no plans to widen I-70 west of I-25. For information on congestion along I-70, west of I-25, please see TRANS4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p></div></div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments																
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 157	Last: Romero	First: Jessica																	
<div><div><p><b>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</b></p><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 31, 2014.</p></div><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Date: <u>9-25-14</u> Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p><p>Name (required): <u>Jessica L. Romero</u></p><p>Organization: _____</p><p>Address (required): _____</p><p>City/State/Zip: _____</p><p>Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p><table><tr><td>Air quality</td><td>Environmental justice</td><td>Financing</td><td>Hazardous materials</td><td>Historic</td></tr><tr><td>Managed lanes</td><td><u>Noise</u></td><td>Property impacts</td><td><u>Swansea Elementary</u></td><td>Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td><u>Truck traffic</u></td><td>Other</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.</p><div><div>A</div><div><p>I like the idea of having a tunnel. I lived in Swansea for 21 years and this is one of the best ideas I've heard of. It is safe for all of the community. Safe for the children when crossing the street. And plus it will improve the looks of the neighborhood.</p></div></div><p>****CONTINUE ON BACK FOR MORE SPACE****</p><div><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 14, 2014, to:</p><p>I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p></div></div>					Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic	Managed lanes	<u>Noise</u>	Property impacts	<u>Swansea Elementary</u>	Visual	Preliminary identified preferred alternative	<u>Truck traffic</u>	Other			<div><div>A</div><div><p>Comment noted.</p></div></div>
Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic																
Managed lanes	<u>Noise</u>	Property impacts	<u>Swansea Elementary</u>	Visual																
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	<u>Truck traffic</u>	Other																		

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	017	Last:	Romero
				First:	Rachel
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>1-70 PROPOSAL</b></p> <p><b>From:</b></p> <p><b>Date:</b> Wed, September 3, 2014 2:03 pm</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p>					
<div><div>A</div><div><p>I live off of 50th and Pecos and my son attends Beach Court Elementary, 1/4 mile away from I-70. My family supports the proposal to look into re-routing I-70.</p><p>My primary concern with any plan to repair/fix/widen I-70 as it currently exists is that literally thousands of children and families will be exposed to unnecessary noise and air pollution. There are several schools within half a mile of I-70 between in this area so that is not at all an exaggeration. We have a duty to protect our children, if they attempt to repair and widen I-70 they will be playing outside every day breathing in construction debris and there is no possible way to protect them from this but we can avoid it.</p><p>The nice "parkway" style design in North Denver that they propose in this North Denver neighborhood is a great idea. That area was not the most beautiful and now looks 100% better with that "parkway" style design. I think that this Chaffee park neighborhood deserves this "parkway" at street level as opposed to the highway as it sits now. The displacements that widening I-70 would cause can be avoided by re-routing I-70 and our neighborhood will be all the more beautiful without the blight of the highway running through it.</p><p>I see many pros to re-routing highway, and many cons to repair/fix/widen I-70 - please take my thoughts into consideration.</p><p>Thank you,</p><p>Rachel Romero</p></div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div><p>The I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative was evaluated and eliminated because it did not meet the project’s purpose and need. For information on the I-270/I-76 Reroute Alternative, please see ALT3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q. CDOT has no plans to widen I-70 east of I-25.</p><p>Air quality concerns have been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on air quality in the project area after construction and mitigating fugitive dust during construction, please see AQ3 and IMP7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p></div></div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	696	Last:	Ron
				First:	Odie
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Odie Ron"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Fri, October 31, 2014 11:13 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Odie Ron</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Hazardous Materials,Managed Lanes,Noise,Property Impacts,Visual,Truck Traffic,Other</p> <p>comments: Things to alleviate traffic on the I70 corridor between Glenwood Springs and Golden: Only local Truck use during winter months. Trucks not allowed in left lane. No trucks or non 4WD on snowy days on the passes. Open medians and shoulders and local roads for traffic flow Have state troopers and local police used to enforce and help guide traffic. No construction on roads during winter months. Only use LED road signs in emergency, they slow traffic.</p>				<p><b>A</b> The scope of this project is I-70 between I-25 and Tower Road. For more information on the project limits, see GEN2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	



Comments					Responses to Comments	
Source: Public hearing transcript		Document Number: 279	Last: Royer	First: Dennis		
A	<p>I live in Park Hill. I have over 40 years of EIS and freeway construction experience across the country. My last was in Massachusetts as the Chief of Public Works and Transportation, Commissioner of Public Works for the City of Boston. I came after the Big Dig. I have 30 years of experience dealing with CDOT. I was here for the Mousetrap reconstruction and I was instrumental in maintaining the Washington Street interchange, which CDOT was bound and determined to close. My last assignment for the City and County of Denver was the city coordinator for the T-REX project.</p>					
	<p>I'm glad to say CDOT is using the depressed section proposed by the city and county staff back in the 1990s when we were looking at expanding from the Mousetrap and funding only got us as far as Brighton Boulevard. This neighborhood has lived through 60 years of bad CDOT decisions. It's time that we correct it with this project. If you use the T-REX design standards, which FHWA approved, the proposed cross-sections here are grossly excessive. You can build the necessary roadway at a 200-foot cross-section. You put 46th Avenue on the south side only. You do not need frontage roads. That's a pro-roadway, pro-traffic, pro-truck type of interchange usage that you don't need. You also don't need the split diamond at Steele and Colorado Boulevard. Just go ahead and build a full one at Colorado Boulevard. The neighbors will be able to get out either on Brighton or Washington or Colorado.</p>					
	<p>You only need eight lanes. If you want two managed lanes, then do concurrent flow in each direction, like they did in Virginia, separated by barriers. It's an approved design by FHWA, and it allows you to have managed lanes in both directions. You need to narrow the cross-section, okay. You need to protect these neighborhoods. Do not exacerbate the previous bad decisions. If you really look at the cross-section that's here, they have the ability to expand within the depressed section to 12 lanes in the future. Thank you.</p>					
					A	<p>The project team worked collaboratively with the local agencies during the design process to determine the appropriate level of east-west and north-south connectivity for the local roadway network. The current design achieves the desired goals of the local agencies by maximizing connectivity of the local network, while keeping roadway widths to a minimum and providing a level of redundancy to assist in emergency vehicle response to the properties on both sides of I-70.</p>
						<p>For information on the Steele Street/Vasquez Boulevard interchange, please see PA6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>
						<p>The Preferred Alternative is a result of CDOT’s efforts to minimize the project footprint and impacts, while allowing the flexibility to provide capacity for years to come. CDOT will continue to look for ways to reduce the width through final design.</p>
						<p>For information on the need for 10 lanes, please see GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 568	Last: Royer	First: Dennis		
<p>Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to</p> <p>Welcome: contactus@i-70east.com</p> <p>I-70 SDEIS Comments</p> <p>From: "Dennis Royer"</p> <p>Date: Thu, October 30, 2014 1:44 pm</p> <p>To: "contactus@i-70east.com" &lt;contactus@i-70east.com&gt;</p> <p>Priority: Normal</p> <p>Please see the attached comments regarding the I-70 SDEIS. Hard copy to follow.</p>					
				The information in the cover letter is noted. Responses to specific comments are included on the following pages.	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 568	Last: Royer	First: Dennis	
A	<b>Comments on the I-70 East SDEIS by Dennis E. Royer, P.E.</b>				
	Before enumerating my comments on this document, allow me to provide some background on my experience. I have over 40 years of professional engineering expertise as a private consultant and working for local government with the City and County of Denver and the City of Boston. I have not only assisted in writing environmental analyses, I reviewed and participated in every one for the jurisdictions I was employed by. Relative to this analysis, I worked with CDOT on the Mouse Trap (I-25/I-70) interchange reconstruction and the extension to Brighton Boulevard. I worked with the Globeville neighborhood to keep the Washington Street Interchange open. I am quite familiar with the issues associated with this corridor.				
	<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>				
B	For a basic document of 762 pages with technical report documentation of 4881 pages, totaling 5343 pages, you would expect that the document would be thorough and complete – but it is not. Thankfully, technology allows us to review it on line rather than carry around printed copies. However, these documents are not intended for the professional technicians, they are intended for the average citizen who may be directly impacted by these decisions. As a result, there is need for clarification throughout the document. Also, the lack of complete analysis, particularly related to the preferred alternative with managed lanes, suggests that the preferred alternative has been “predetermined” which is a definite “No-No “in environmental analyses.				
	<b>Managed lanes:</b>				
	The SDEIS admits that further study and documentation will be forthcoming involving the managed lane concept in the Final EIS. It seems rather premature to declare to the citizenry that the preferred alternative is managed lanes when further documentation is not available. The supporting data that is provided is inconclusive and based solely on the DynusT model results. The basic conclusion for the preferred alternative is that the lower capacity option of managed lanes will outperform the higher capacity alternative of general purpose lanes by forcing traffic off the freeway. Yet, the report fails to identify this shift in volumes, where it shifts to and the impact it has on these other facilities as a result. The report actually shows less volume shifting off the freeway for the managed lanes options than the general purpose lanes options which seems contradictory to reality. The justification given is a spreading of departure times associated supposedly with the increased tolls, although not clearly stated. What seems missing is that the general purpose lanes alternatives may also achieve a spreading of departure times to avoid congestion.				
	Then there is the whole issue of determining how the managed lanes are created within the corridor. The study corridor is identified as Interstate 25 to Tower Road, but the drawings and visualization fail to reach I-25. They show the managed lanes extending beyond Brighton Boulevard to the west but do not illustrate any termination. Do they connect to the managed lanes on I-25, which would make perfect sense? If so, how much reconstruction is required at the Mouse Trap, and are these costs included in the overall cost estimate? The report states that additional widening does not occur west of Brighton, which would mean there is no interface with existing lanes which seems like a grand omission. However, the				
	<b>A</b> CDOT and FHWA are committed to the examination and avoidance of potential impacts to the social and natural environment when considering approval of proposed transportation projects. In addition to evaluating the potential environmental effects, the EIS takes into account the transportation needs of the public in reaching a decision that is in the best overall public interest. The Supplemental Draft EIS and Final EIS are fully compliant with the requirements of NEPA, the Clean Air Act, and CDOT and FHWA guidance. CEQ regulation 1502.14(e) states that the agency should identify a preferred alternative if one exists.				
	<b>B</b> Sections 3.3 and 8.5 of the Final EIS provide the reasons for including managed lanes in the Preferred Alternative. The managed lanes provide greater throughput on the highway by increasing speeds and travel times through the corridor for two of the five lanes, and therefore increasing the number of cars that pass through the corridor compared to the number of cars that congested general purpose lanes would pass through. The increased capacity on I-70 will keep traffic from using the local street network compared to the No-Action Alternative. Chapter 8, Phased Project Implementation, of the Final EIS includes more detailed information on the proposed managed lanes and additional traffic model discussions.				
	The project does not include any direct connection to the I-25 managed lanes. The following describes the proposed managed lane connections for the Phase 1 project. Eastbound traffic that is passing over I-25 will be able to move into a managed lane on the left side of the highway immediately east of I-25. This will be accomplished by restriping the existing left shoulder to accommodate the single managed lane. No widening will occur between I-25 and Brighton Boulevard. At Brighton Boulevard, there will be an ingress location for eastbound traffic to enter into the managed lane. This ingress is primarily designed to accommodate traffic that has entered I-70 from I-25. Continuing east, at Holly Street there will be an ingress/egress location that will allow eastbound vehicles to enter the managed lane or exit the managed lane. This location is designed to accommodate traffic that has entered I-70 from Colorado Boulevard and to allow drivers to exit the managed lane and exit I-70 at Quebec Street or Central Park Boulevard. Further to the east there is a planned egress location at Peoria Street. This egress from the managed lane will allow drivers to exit I-70 at I-225, Chambers Road, and Peña Boulevard. Finally, the managed lane will continue east and terminate just east of the Peña Boulevard exit ramp. All remaining managed lane traffic will merge left into a general-purpose lane and can exit I-70 at Airport Boulevard or continue to other destinations farther east of the study area.				
	Westbound traffic that is entering the study area from locations east of Airport Boulevard and traffic that has entered I-70 from Peña Boulevard will be able to move into a managed lane on the left side of the highway near the I-225 interchange. This will be accomplished by widening the highway to accommodate the single westbound managed lane. Minor widening of the highway will occur between I-225 and Quebec Street to allow the managed lane to continue along the left side of the highway up to the point where the Phase 1 full reconstruction is planned. At Peoria Street, there will be an ingress location for westbound traffic to enter into the managed lane. This ingress is primarily designed to accommodate traffic that has entered I-70 from I-225. Continuing west, at Holly Street there will be an ingress/egress location that will allow westbound vehicles to enter the managed lane or exit the managed lane. This location is designed to accommodate traffic that has entered I-70 from Quebec Street and Central Park Boulevard and to allow drivers to exit the managed lane and exit I-70 at Colorado Boulevard. Further to the west, there is a planned egress location at Brighton Boulevard. This egress from the managed lane will allow drivers to exit I-70 at I-25. Finally, the managed lane will continue west and terminate just west of the I-25 exit ramp. All remaining managed lane traffic will merge left into a general-purpose lane and can exit I-70 or continue to other destinations farther west of the study area.				



Comments					Responses to Comments		
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	568	Last:	Royer	First:	Dennis
B	Page 2 – SDEIS Royer Comments						
	technical traffic report accompanying the report in Volume II provides a contradictory statement “--- an eastbound vehicle that enters at I-25 and continues all the way to Tower Road will be subject to a toll charge at the I-25 ingress, at the Holly Street egress ---”(page 129). It also mentions egress points at Holly and Peoria which are not identified in the report.						
	The report does not give a detailed explanation of how the managed lanes will operate. Based on statements in the report and the technical traffic report, it seems that they will operate through the twelve hours of the defined peak periods, but this is not clarified. Will the managed lanes be open to general traffic during other hours, or open during specified periods to be determined (maybe in the additional analysis not yet done)? Since the report does not provide these details, what parameters were utilized by the DynusT modelling to create the assignments?						
C	The plan view drawings accompanying the analysis are very difficult to decipher. If I have difficulty as a professional, then the general public has no chance. It appears that the managed lanes start/end at Pena Boulevard, but it is difficult to see. If notations were provided on these drawings, it would certainly improve the presentation and understanding. Also consider darkening the lines to make them stand out from the aerial photograph background.						
	Then there is the whole issue of having a plan for managed lanes on the freeway system. The planned direct connections at I-270, I-225 and Pena Boulevard do not clearly show up on the drawings. It seems as though managed lanes may be provided on I-270 with its future expansion and on I-225, but that cannot be determined from the drawings, nor is it detailed in the report. Other than stating that these connections will be made in the report, there is no further clarification and whether this fits into an overall master plan for managed lanes in the metro area. The real question is whether there is a plan for managed lanes or is CDOT simply putting them in every corridor where widening occurs without a systematic plan? This is not discussed anywhere in the report. It is just concluded that managed lanes are a good idea and should be implemented. It would bolster the case for managed lanes if a comprehensive master plan had actually been developed and was included in the analysis. Rumor has it that CDOT has agreed to put managed lanes in any widening in the DRCOG metro area to satisfy complaints about installing managed lanes on C-470 which was the genesis for the Transportation Commission Directive.						
C	<b><u>46<sup>th</sup> Avenue:</u></b>						
	If there is one element of the report that requires additional, detailed clarification, it is the various descriptions of 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue, both as it exists today and in the future reconstruction. The typical cross sections and generalized discussions do not clearly describe 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue. From the presentation, an unfamiliar reader would get the impression that 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue is a two-way, four-lane, signalized roadway running from I-25 to Colorado Boulevard, which is anything like the actual case. Even under the viaduct it is reduced to three lanes, one westbound and two eastbound. It becomes a meandering two-lane street on the western end between 44 <sup>th</sup> Street and Washington Street. On the east it terminates at a stop sign at approximately Monroe Street and meanders south to 40 <sup>th</sup> Avenue and north along the						
	C The text has been updated in the Final EIS to address the comment. The Preferred Alternative as presented in the Final EIS includes 46th Avenue on both sides of the highway as two way in some areas and one way in others. There are no changes to 46th Avenue west of the Brighton interchange with any of the alternatives in the Final EIS. Chapter 3, Summary of Project Alternatives, of the Final EIS explains the configuration of the 46th Avenue and Attachment A includes conceptual drawings of the highway design including 46th Avenue.						



Comments					Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 568	Last: Royer	First: Dennis		
C	Page 3 – SDEIS Royer Comments					D
	freeway as a two-way frontage road to 48 <sup>th</sup> Avenue. What generates a significant increase in traffic is the termination of Vasquez Boulevard onto 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue which Denver has tried to eliminate for years. There is a better description of 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue in the Technical Traffic Report although it is not completely accurate.					
	Similar to the managed lanes, the accompanying drawings for the preferred alternative do not illustrate what happens to 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue west of Brighton Boulevard along the National Western Complex. In fact, the drawings simply show a diamond interchange at Brighton with no 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue. This is a major omission relative to the impact on the neighborhood and adjoining uses, especially the National Western.					
	The visualization and animation drawings on the I-70 East website states that the illustrations are the “preliminary preferred alternative” but show a one-way frontage road couplet on both sides of the interstate between Brighton and York Street. They do not illustrate any connection for 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue west of Brighton. Although it could be argued that these drawings are not part of the “official” SDEIS document, it is misleading to present the wrong alternative for public review on the website. In any case, the description of 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue in the report should clearly identify the various cross sections, not just show a typical cross section, and let it be understood that two-way frontage roads are being provided except adjacent to the cover, when that is clearly NOT the case.					
	The visualization drawings do not show a diamond interchange at Colorado Boulevard. There is no eastbound off ramp or westbound on ramp, but there are one-way frontage roads between Colorado and Jackson. The frontage roads then convert to two-way west of Jackson but are three lanes, not two, as described in the report. The missing on/off ramps for Colorado finally show up at Steele (which is not the preferred alternative, but the basic option).					
D	The Brighton Boulevard slide shows a second local street between Gaylord and High with no access to 46 <sup>th</sup> . A second roadway is a further intrusion into the neighborhood that is not discussed in the report. Why not simply let Gaylord, Vine, Race and High intersect 46 <sup>th</sup> or cul-de-sac them as shown for Williams.					Since the Supplemental Draft EIS was published, additional analyses and content review have been performed for many of the resources discussed in the Traffic Technical Report. These updates, along with changes resulting from the comments received on the Supplemental Draft EIS, have been incorporated into the Final EIS. Section 4.2 includes a discussion on the projects included in the 2035 DRCOG modeling, and includes all transit and highway improvements that are planned and programmed. For information on how traffic forecasting was determined for this project, please see TRANS5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.
	The detailed design maps for the alternatives provided on the website finally show 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue west of Brighton. It is dead ended, not even cul-de saced at the alley west of Brighton which does not meet Denver standards for terminating a street. It remains the same as today under the viaduct to Washington. This limits access to the National Western entirely off 44 <sup>th</sup> Street on the south. This is a significant change for event traffic, but once again, it is NOT mentioned in the report.					
	The entire handling of 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue and its impact on adjoining land uses and the neighborhood is treated in the report as “So What!!!”					
D	<u>Modelling:</u>					The peak spreading effect is more pronounced in the managed lane alternatives, because there are fewer general-purpose lanes on the highway. There is some peak spreading that does occur for the non-managed lane alternatives; however, when drivers know that all of the lanes on the highway are general-purpose lanes, they are less likely to alter their driving behaviors and change the times of the day when they go to work or leave work. When the managed lanes are added to the freeway and there are fewer general-purpose lane, then drivers are more likely to alter their travel times and this produces a more pronounced peak spread.
	I cannot comment on the effectiveness of the DynusT model, but the entire analysis and conclusions are based upon it and its supposed accuracy. Historic experience shows that models are only 70% accurate					

Comments					Responses to Comments
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 568	Last: Royer	First: Dennis	
D	Page 4 – SDEIS Royer Comments				
	<p>at best, and tend to over forecast volumes for freeways compared to arterials. This is the newest and probably best of available models, but with no information being provided relative to modal splits or other inputted assumptions, it is not possible to comment on the accuracy of the modelling of the various alternatives, even if it is based on the regional transportation plan.</p>				
	<p>Then there is the issue of the Metro Vision 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. Reading the plan only gives generalities as to the assumptions that are entered into the model. I do not question DRCOG’s ability, but I do question whether the model has a proper basis for 2035. The goal stated in the plan is a reduction of VMT by 10% by 2035. According to data released by the U.S department of Transportation and the Census Bureau, Denver/Aurora has the ninth highest reduction in VMT across the nation in 2013, at 10.6% already exceeding the regional plan goal by 20 years. Estimated vehicle miles traveled on all roads in the US peaked in 2005, and have decreased by 9.27% since. The other goals of increased urban centers and increased urban density are already occurring and expanding which have created this existing reduction in VMT.</p>				
	<p>Then there is the issue of mass transit in the plan. The only expansion shown is an apparent high speed transit line on Parker Road. Completion of FasTracks is forecast for 2020, but RTD has yet to develop any expansion beyond FasTracks, so long range planning of mass transit appears underestimated in the plan. This leads to the conclusion that VMT and transit usage are not accurately inputted in the model, so all forecasts are over estimating vehicular volumes, particularly on freeways.</p>				The information on these pages has been reviewed. Responses to specific comments are included on the previous page.
	<p>The use of screen line data is a gimmick utilized to avoid showing impacts of the alternatives on other roadways, as well as displaying exactly where the model is assigning the traffic. It would be more believable, especially in checking the validity of the model assignments, if volumes were shown for the various available roadways. This would simply require taking the already produced volumes from the screen lines and placing them in a chart or drawing in the technical analysis with a summary in the SDEIS report.</p>				
	<p>In conjunction with the screen lines, it is interesting to note that the managed lanes alternatives divert more traffic from the other roadways than the general purpose alternatives. This could use some explanation, since the managed lanes are a lower capacity alternative than the general purpose lanes alternative. It suggests that the time savings incorporated in the model has a more significant impact on travel than the pricing factor. Since little is explained and further analysis is to be provided later, one can only assume what is happening with the modelling.</p>				
	<p>Another anomaly shown in the report is the daily traffic volumes for the managed lanes versus the general purpose lanes. In Exhibit 4-24 the daily volumes for managed lanes compared to general purpose lanes are only slightly lower. Unless the managed lanes are open to general traffic during off hours, the difference should be significant. The lower portion of the exhibit showing peak period volumes shows a more expected difference due to lower capacity in the managed lanes and the set goal of 45 mph operating speed. The upper part of the exhibit is quite confusing with the lines not clearly differentiated. It needs an expanded Y - axis or fewer alternatives on the drawing for clarification.</p>				

Comments					Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 568	Last: Royer	First: Dennis		
Page 5 – SDEIS Royer Comments						
E		<b><u>Lane Balance:</u></b>				
		An ongoing issue over the years has been the question of lane balance when merging two freeways into one. CDOT historically tries to take multi-lane merges and reduce them into a single lane. This results in congestion on the freeway section for sometimes miles. This could easily be solved by adding an additional lane to that section. T-REX congests daily between I-225 and C-470 for just this reason. The new Santa Fe flyover creates the same problem northbound on I-25 throughout the day. When the airport tunnels existed on I-70, there were horrific backups merging five lanes into three. CDOT eventually added a fourth lane, then with the Central Park Boulevard interchange created five lanes into five lanes at least until dropping the lane at Havana. The current design for the SDEIS shows seven lanes merging into six, which will cause congestion. It states that I-270 will be widened in the future, so will that create eight lanes into six? Why not have seven lanes between I-270 and I-225 and avoid creating congestion in this difficult section.				
<b><u>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</u></b>						
<b><u>Executive Summary:</u></b>						
F		Page ES-5: Limited transportation capacity – “The forecast ranges from 117,000 to 285,000 vehicles per day depending on the location in the corridor.” <b>Check this versus your diagrams which show over 300,000 vpd between I-270 and I-225.</b>				
G		Page ES-9: What is the projects preliminary identified Preferred Alternative and why? – “---is the preliminary Preferred Alternative because it meets the project purpose and need , best addresses community concerns, has the most community and agency support, and - with the proposed mitigations - appears to cause the least overall impact.” <b>There is no proof of this. It says both the Basic and Modified Options are being evaluated in more detail. Next paragraph says “The recommended Preferred Alternative is evaluated fully in this document---. “ Is this contradictory saying evaluated fully and is being evaluated in more detail?</b>				
H		Page ES-9: “---traffic volumes on I-70 will increase between 30 percent and 50 recent in the Build Alternatives ---“. <b>From Exhibits ES-4 and ES-5 volumes increase between 23% and 97%.</b>				
I		Page ES-14: How will social and economic conditions be affected? “--- as well as redevelopment opportunities in existing neighborhoods, such as Elyria and Swansea Neighborhood.” <b>How does loss of 20 businesses, 49 residences and the York and Steele interchanges improve redevelopment opportunities in the neighborhood?</b>				
<b><u>Chapter 3 – Summary of Project Alternatives:</u></b>						
J		Page 3-18: 3.7.1 – Operational Options: “Pricing and policies for managed lanes will be determined through separate study to be included in the FEIS.” <b>This should be addressed in the SDEIS for decision making purposes. Waiting until the FEIS only allows the public one shot at questioning the decision</b>				



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	568	Last:	Royer
			First:	Dennis	
Page 6 – SDEIS Royer Comments					
J		before going to the ROD. The SDEIS should be as complete as possible in order to recommend a preferred alternative, even if you call it “preliminary”.			
K		Page 3-21: Exhibit 3-12 Revised Viaduct Alternative – General Purpose Lanes: Drawing shows 16 ft. inside shoulders. <b>Width is excessive and allows for restriping to 12 lanes in future, but is not mentioned in report why width is beyond normal requirements.</b>			
L		Page 3-22: Exhibit 3-13 Revised Viaduct Alternative – Managed lanes: Drawing shows 12 ft. outside and 8 ft. inside shoulders. <b>Width is still excessive and would allow for 12 lanes in the future by restriping, but is not mentioned in report.</b>			
M		Page 3-22: Section 3.7.2: States “--- 46 <sup>th</sup> Avenue will run underneath the highway as a two-lane roadway with turn lanes ---.” <b>Exhibit shows a four-lane road with turn lanes – two in each direction.</b>			
N		Page 2-23: Section 3.7.3 Partial Cover Lowered Alternative: “---Highway will start descending west of Brighton ---.” <b>This necessitates rebuilding the existing Brighton overpass which is not mentioned. It is mentioned in the Technical Traffic analysis.</b>			
O		Page 3-26: Exhibit 3-16: Shows 12 lanes between I-270 and I-225 which requires two lanes from I-270 to merge into one and three lanes from I-225 to merge into one lane. <b>This is the lane balance issue which is not addressed adequately with this design. Over 300,000 vpd are forecast for this section. These merges will cause congestion unless at least fourteen lanes are provided.</b>			
P		Page 3-26: Last paragraph: “---result in a cross section that is approximately three times greater than the existing footprint.” <b>This should say “more than three times greater (3.22)” to be accurate and truthful.</b>			
Q		Page 3-28: Third paragraph: “An increased length of cover will require consideration for additional safety features, such as fire suppression and ventilation systems.” <b>What is the source for this statement? Idaho Springs Twin Tunnels are longer and do not have these requirements (unless recently added in reconstruction).</b>			
R		Page 3-29: Exhibit 3-19: Shows twelve lanes between I-270 and I-225. <b>Same comment as before on lane balance.</b>			
S		Page 3-30: First paragraph below exhibits: “---result in a highway footprint that is approximately three times greater than the existing---.” <b>This is really misleading. Depressed section is reduced by 16 feet, but overall cross section is increased to 292 feet with wider frontage roads. This should say “nearly three and a half (3.43) times wider than existing to be accurate. The word smithing is definitely trying to understate the situation.</b>			
T		Page 3-37: exhibit 3-27: Summarizes maintenance costs on an annual basis showing \$10-\$16 M for various options. <b>How are these costs calculated? CDOT has never spent this much annually on the</b>			
K		The benefits of shoulder widening have been discussed in further detail in Chapter 4, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation Measures of the Final EIS. The Final EIS includes modified text to reflect the safety improvements gained by improved shoulder widths. The general-purpose lane options are being designed so in the future if managed lanes need to be added, the appropriate width is available. Four feet is needed between the existing general-purpose lanes and the potential managed lanes. For this reason, the general-purpose lane and managed lane options are being designed at the same width.			
L		The benefits of shoulder widening have been discussed in further detail in Chapter 4, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation Measures of the Final EIS. The Final EIS includes modified text to reflect the safety improvements gained by improved shoulder widths.			
M		46th Avenue will run underneath the viaduct as a two-lane road with a turn lane in each direction.			
N		No modifications are being made to Brighton Boulevard as part of the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative.			
O		I-225 and I-270 were included in the models and were considered in the analysis. Traffic analysis that has been completed to date indicates that I-70 operations near the I-225 and I-270 interchanges will likely improve with the Preferred Alternative compared to the No-Action Alternative. See Chapter 4, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation Measures, and Attachment E, Traffic Technical Report, for further information on the traffic analysis.			
P		Comment noted.			
Q		This section of highway has a higher volume of traffic than most, as well as greater air quality issues. These safety features are under consideration for the safety and wellbeing of the motorists and residents in the area.			
R		I-225 and I-270 were included in the models and were considered in the analysis. Traffic analysis that has been completed to date indicates that I-70 operations near the I-225 and I-270 interchanges will likely improve with the Preferred Alternative compared to the No-Action Alternative. See Chapter 4, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation Measures, and Attachment E, Traffic Technical Report, for further information on the traffic analysis.			
S		Comment noted.			
T		The maintenance costs were estimated for each alternative using an annual unit cost for bridge, retaining walls, and pavement. For the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative, additional costs for the cover associated with the potential urban landscape, ventilation, fire, and life safety features were calculated.			



Comments					Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 568	Last: Royer	First: Dennis		
Page 7 - Royer SDEIS Comments						
T		existing viaduct. Are the costs for cumulative maintenance when performed for paving, repairs, expansion joints, etc. then divided by years to get an annual cost?				
U		Page 3-42: Support from local officials: <b>Letters of support mentioned are not included in the report for public review. The support is for the depressed section and the cover to minimize the impact on the adjacent neighborhood. Three elected Denver officials (two councilwomen and the auditor) are publicly opposed to the overall cross section and frontage roads as presented.</b>				
V		Page 3-46: Operational flexibility and mobility: “This option accommodates express buses --- promotes use of RTD buses---.” <b>There is an adjacent rail line paralleling the corridor. What express buses will be running in the managed lanes? RTD buses will function as a feeder service to the rail stations. Local service will stay similar to today. Is RTD intending to run competing service to rail along this corridor?</b>				
<u>Chapter 4 – Transportation Impacts and Mitigation Measures:</u>						
W		Page 4-2: Existing local connectivity: “There are 18 major roadways within the study area---.” <b>Columbine, Clayton and Garfield are NOT major streets; they are local streets that pass under I-70.</b>				
X		Page 4-3: Exhibit 4-2 – Existing north – south connectivity across I-70: Exhibit shows Monaco as though it were an equivalent N-S connection. <b>Monaco dead ends one block north of I-70. Dahlia and Holly terminate at 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 52<sup>nd</sup> Avenue respectively. They do not cross I-270 because of Sand Creek. Only Colorado Boulevard and Quebec Street provide any real continuity to the north. The emphasis on connectivity is somewhat misleading and seems to be built up as an issue of importance relative to the SDEIS, probably noting the barrier effect of the interstate. However, if this is relevant, then you should point out that the Parkhill Neighborhood (2 miles of frontage Colorado to Quebec has 5 “supposed” connections, but only two with any continuity to the north. Whereas, Elyria/Swansea (1.5 miles of frontage Brighton to Colorado) has 8 N-S connections, 4 with continuity. That is if this issue is really that important. Most high income neighborhoods desire and have minimum connectivity for exclusion purposes.</b>				
Y		Page 4-4: 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph: “Colfax Avenue is the only roadway other than I-70 that provides continuous east-west connectivity through the study area from I-25 to Tower Road.” <b>This is a “TOTALLY ERRONEOUS STATEMENT” based on Exhibit 4-1. The study area only extends north-south between Martin Luther King Boulevard and 56<sup>th</sup> Avenue, approximately one mile on each side of the interstate. Colfax Avenue is two miles south of MLK and is not in the study area. It is in the modelling area.</b>				
Z		Page 4-4: 2nd paragraph:” Various other roadways provide parallel route choices for shorter distances within the study area---.” <b>17<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue are also outside the study area by over a mile and more. 56<sup>th</sup> Avenue actually extends from Brighton past Tower. It is only two lanes west of Quebec, but could be upgraded in the future. Exhibit 4-1 shows Smith Road as continuous when it dead ends west of the old taxiway. It is also grade separated from Colorado Boulevard. I hope it was</b>				
U		Letters from local officials and agencies were received during the public review period for the Supplemental Draft EIS. These are included in Attachment Q of the Final EIS, Supplemental Draft EIS Comments and Responses.				
V		“Buses” is used in a general sense in this statement. A bus could mean a variety of types and brands, also servicing a variety of different areas along the corridor other than the areas that the RTD rail line will service.				
W		Comment noted.				
X		Connectivity was adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on north-south connectivity with the Preferred Alternative, please see PA9 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.				
Y		The 2035 DRCOG travel demand model includes the entire Denver metro region, and the study area for the DynusT model goes well south of Colfax and north of 72nd Avenue.				
Z		Smith Road was not modeled as a continuous road and did not have connection to Colorado Boulevard in the existing conditions analysis. Future year models did account for the planned extension of this roadway. In addition, future year models do not include Smith Road under Colorado Boulevard as that portion of the roadway has already been closed and will remain closed in the future.				

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 568	Last: Royer	First: Dennis	
Z   A1  B1  C1  D1  E1	Page 8 - Royer SDEIS Comments				
	not coded as continuous in the modelling for existing conditions. It is being constructed and extended to Central park Boulevard.				
	Page 4-12: Existing I-70 traffic volumes: “Bi-directional daily volumes are lowest – less than 75,000 vpd – at the east and west ends of the study area, primarily because there are two lanes in each direction of I-70 for these portions of the highway.” Another “TOTALLY ERRONEOUS STATEMENT”!!! Did anyone at the consulting firm or CDOT check this? The real concern is does anyone there believe this? When did laneage on an interstate highway cause a reduction in demand? The reduction on the east end is due to a reduction in development east of Tower. On the west end it is the significant desire of traffic to use I-25 to enter/exit downtown and areas to the south. Northbound traffic has already utilized I-76 to get to I-25 unless it has a local destination south of I-76.				
	Page 4-20: Exhibit 4-18: The exhibit does not show any improvements on Brighton Boulevard though the Mayor has announced a \$40+ M upgrade to the corridor.				
	Page 4-26: Effects on transit service facilities: “Transit travel times and variability could potentially improve by implementing managed lanes. Providing an incentive for buses to travel in the managed lanes could reduce transit delay by allowing buses to avoid roadway congestion.” RTD is spending a billion dollars building a rail line parallel to the highway corridor. Why would they run buses in the managed lanes? Did you get this from RTD or did someone put this in because they thought it sounded good to support the managed lanes concept? Intercity buses from Trailways and Greyhound might use the lanes, but I don’t think that is the intent of these statements.				
	Page 4-27: Effects on trucking facilities: “Overall the Build Alternatives will improve highway freight transport --- by adding capacity on I-70 ---.” This may be partially true. Capacity in the managed lanes alternatives comes with a price – literally! There is no general lane capacity increase in the managed lanes alternatives. Will local trucking firms and interstate trucking pay the price, which of course we really don’t know yet, because we are waiting on more study! What is the current truck usage on the I-25 managed lanes? That might provide a barometer for what can be expected.				
Page 4-29: Future I-70 Volumes “colored box”: “All of the Build Alternatives show the ability to process an equal amount of traffic on I-70. As a performance measure, traffic volumes on I-70 are not a distinguishing factor between alternatives.” This is another “TOTALLY ERRONEOUS STATEMENT”. Capacity of a freeway lane is 2200 vph. Five general purpose lanes will accommodate 11,000 vph Managed lanes with a minimum speed at 45 mph will carry at least 15% -20% less or 10,000-10,300 vph with three general traffic lanes. Multiplied over the twelve hours identified as the peak periods, that is a daily reduction of approximately 12,000 vpd (in one direction only). This is NOT considered significant when analyzing alternatives. It seems like another attempt to eliminate any negatives that might not support the managed lanes concept. An EIS is to be up front on all the issues and present the pros and cons. Is this another way of helping to “predetermine” the preferred alternative?					
A1		The volumes reported in the document here are service volumes—volumes projected to be served by I-70 and not demand volumes. The commenter is correct about the reasons why the service volumes are lower on these portions of the highway. The demand volumes may be much higher, but are not reported here. For information on how the traffic forecasting model was determined for this project, please see TRANS5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.			
B1		The graphic has been updated in the Final EIS because funding for the project was identified after publication of Supplemental Draft EIS. The document takes into consideration the volumes from the new development, if the project was submitted to DRCOG for inclusion in the regional travel demand model as a regionally significant project; this is the responsibility of the local agency and not CDOT or FHWA.			
C1		“Buses” is used in a general sense in this statement. A bus could mean a variety of types and brands, also servicing a variety of different areas along the corridor other than the areas that the RTD rail line will service.			
D1		Truck traffic is adequately considered in the Final EIS. For information about truck traffic on I-70, please see TRANS8 and TRANS9 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.			
E1		All of the Build Alternatives have the same lane configurations with the full reconstruction of I-70 between Brighton Boulevard and Tower Road, regardless of whether the highway is on a viaduct or below grade. The Managed Lanes Option does have different performance than the General-Purpose Lanes Option. Reducing the number of general-purpose lanes from five to three and adding the two managed lanes does not result in a decrease in demand for the highway, but rather results in a more noticeable peak spread effect. Thus, at the end of the day the number of vehicles being processed by the highway is about the same, but for the Managed Lanes Option the peaks just take longer to process the vehicles.			



Comments					Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 568	Last: Royer	First: Dennis		
Page 9 – Royer SDEIS Comments						
		<b>Chapter 5 – Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation:</b>				
F1		Page 5.2-8: Montbello: “The neighborhood is primarily made up of single-family homes, although there are some businesses along Peoria Street and Chambers Road in the southern portion of the neighborhood.” <b>What happened to the two square mile industrial/business park between Havana and Peoria, I-70 to 56<sup>th</sup> Avenue? One third of the neighborhood was left out. This is no different than Globeville and Elyria/Swansea where industrial and business uses are part of the area, not just retail and offices along Peoria and Chambers.</b>				
G1		Page 5.2-33: Exhibit 5.2-15-Conceptual design for activities under the viaduct: <b>Shouldn’t the viaduct columns be shown so we see what impact they will have on the available space?</b>				
H1		Page 5.2-36: 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph: “Overall modifications to I-70 will not cause substantial change in access to or through Northeast Parkhill, and so will not affect mobility or neighborhood cohesion.” <b>Eliminating direct access to Monaco, shifting everything to Quebec will not affect mobility in the neighborhood? You didn’t make the same statement in Elyria/Swansea when you eliminated the Steele/Vasquez connection.</b>				
I1		Page 5.2-40&41: “Commercial businesses, such as the TA Travel Center at the intersection of I-70 and Quebec Street, also benefit from the closeness to I-70 because their customers have ready access and the business is visible to highway drivers.” <b>Did whoever wrote this actually go out in the field and check this? TA is half a mile north on Quebec at approximately 51<sup>st</sup> Avenue (which does not exist due to the Post Office complex on the east and I-270 on the west. There is an overpass for I-270 on Quebec that blocks visibility of TA from the east. It is definitely visible from I-270 from the west, but not from the east.</b>				
J1		Page 5.2-41: 2nd paragraph: <b>Is the Denver Coliseum included in the description of the National Western Complex. It is a separate facility, owned and operated by the City and County of Denver, and has events year round as does the National Western.</b>				
K1		Page 5.2-41: Exhibit 5.2-18 – Annual unemployment rate2007-2011: <b>This can’t be updated to at least 2013. National and State statistics are updated every quarter.</b>				
L1		Page 5.2-46: Partial Covered Lowered Alternative: “Both options of the PCLA will relocate 20 businesses including the Pilot Travel Center.” <b>I picked this section because it includes the preliminary preferred alternative. All of the discussions are the same for all the alternatives and only discuss property tax implications. Retail businesses generate sales taxes which are over half of the Denver general fund budget. Pilot alone generates millions in gas and sales taxes but it is not even discussed.</b>				
F1		Text has been revised in the Final EIS.				
G1		FHWA rules limit the amount of design that can be completed during conceptual design, before signing the Record of Decision. Final column placement will be determined in final design. These graphics are simply providing ideas for what could potentially be placed under the revised viaduct structure.				
H1		All of the Build Alternatives alter the location of the Holly Street interchange ramps to form a more traditional diamond interchange. The slip ramps currently located east of Monaco Street and west of Dahlia Street move to the west of Monaco Street and east of Dahlia Street, respectively. All other interchanges within the study area continue to provide similar access as existing conditions with some modifications to the ramp types that do not affect the overall connectivity. Additionally, the Steele Street/Vasquez Boulevard interchange is being modified, not eliminated as part of the Preferred Alternative. For more information on the modifications to the Steele Street/Vasquez Boulevard interchange, please see PA6 of the of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.				
I1		Regardless of visibility, there is a high usage of the TA Travel Center by truckers because of its ready access to I-70.				
J1		The Denver Coliseum is located in the National Western Stock Show Historic District. In later chapters, the Coliseum is discussed separately, especially if known project impacts may occur. In this instance, the paragraph very generally summarizes the National Western Stock Show Complex as a whole; not necessarily the separate contents of the complex.				
K1		Statistics can only be used as an accurate reference once they are published. The 2007-2011 statistics were all that were available during the preparation of the Supplemental Draft EIS.				
L1		Comment noted.				

Comments					Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 568	Last: Royer	First: Dennis		
Page 10 – Royer SDEIS Comments						
M1		Page 5.3-30: What are benefits specific to managed lanes option? “Low income populations are more likely to be affected by the negative impacts of congestion because they are more likely to use buses that travel through roadway congestion.” <b>This whole discussion is another attempt to use buses in managed lanes as a sales pitch for managed lanes. There is no presentation in this study from RTD that buses will be using the managed lanes when there is a parallel rail line. When the North line is completed by RTD there will be a station at National Western as well as the East line station at Colorado Boulevard. If you are going to keep using buses as major justification for managed lanes then you need a detailed discussion of how RTD intends to provide the service and why with rail in place.</b>				
N1		Page 5.3-19: Noise: Noise barriers range in height from 11 to 20 feet. <b>There is no explanation why 20-foot noise barriers are necessary. Is this buried in the technical report? T-REX only needed 10-foot noise barriers.</b>				
O1		<u>Chapter 6 – Cumulative Impacts:</u>  Page 6-6: Exhibit 6.3 - Transportation & Development Project Locations: <b>Why utilize an out of date exhibit from the 2008 EIS? We are referred to Exhibits 5.21 -2&amp;3 in the 2008 EIS. Why not update and repeat for this document? You are already at 762 pages, so there can’t be any concern about length or saving paper. This document should be able to stand alone with proper documentation included.</b>				
P1		Page 9&10: 6.5.2 Right of Way & Relocations: “The Rocky Mountain Arsenal’s 1992 conversion --- prompted Denver to annex 2,000 acres of agricultural land for future development of the Gateway area.” <b>Did somebody miss something here? This is minor acquisition that is being pointed out. The DIA acquisition of 50 square miles is mentioned earlier in passing with very little specifics, which actually created the Gateway area.</b>				
Q1		Page 6-18: Other actions: “In terms of long term effects---.” <b>RTD rail and I-70 reconstruction are mentioned as potentially creating development opportunities. There is no mention of the existing freight rail line adjacent to RTD which will have a negative impact on residential development especially for TOD. Freight rail tends to support industrial and commercial warehousing uses. Who wants to live next to a freight rail line that operates 24/7? This is not the east coast where space is limited.</b>				
R1		<u>Alternative Analysis Technical Report:</u>  Page 38: Figure 30- PCLA, MO lane configuration and interchange reconstruction: Shows 12 lanes between I-270 and I-225.				
S1		Page 40: Figure 33 – Typical section of Managed Lanes Option between I-225 and I-270: Shows 10 lanes between I-225 and I-270. <b>MAJOR FAUS PAS!!! Obviously someone is not checking and included the wrong cross section! The Figure 30 states “* Includes 1 additional lane each direction (general purpose or managed lanes)”. Maybe you should show one or both for illustrative purposes.</b>				
Page 11 – Royer SDEIS Comments						
M1 Mitigation strategies being considered by CDOT—used in other highway projects with managed lanes across the nation—include allowing vehicles with two, three, or more occupants and buses to use the managed lanes free of charge. For more information about managed lanes and the benefits, please see PA7 and EJ2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.						
N1 Barrier heights were determined with the current conceptual design. Exact barrier locations and heights will be determined in final design.						
O1 This document is a supplement to the Draft EIS. If there is valid and useful information from the past project documents, it has been used and/or referenced.						
P1 Comment noted.						
Q1 The freight rail corridor referenced in the comment was not included because it pre-existed the 1960 date used for past projects for this analysis. Please see Chapter 6, Cumulative Impacts of the Final EIS for more information.						
R1 The Partial Cover Lowered Alternative does propose 12 lanes between I-225 and I-270.						
S1 The typical section shown in this figure has been updated.						



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source: Submittal		Document Number: 568	Last: Royer	First: Dennis	
T1	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>				
	<b>46<sup>TH</sup> Avenue:</b>				
	The north frontage road should be eliminated in the preferred alternative. It is an additional intrusion into the neighborhood which is unnecessary. Stapleton Drive North should terminate at Colorado Boulevard to prevent unnecessary trips, primarily trucks, from entering the neighborhood. The 46 <sup>th</sup> south frontage road can handle the forecasted volumes as a single two way roadway and minimizes truck impacts for the majority of the neighborhood.				
	<b>Managed Lanes:</b>				
	Since the analysis is incomplete, an overwhelming case for managed lanes has not been made. Rather than going to the Final EIS, the SDEIS should be re-issued when the complete information is available, so a proper comparison between the general purpose lanes and managed lanes can be made by the public. What drives this is the success of T-REX which has no managed lanes and is only eight lanes for nine miles in Denver. Comparisons will and should be made between the two projects, maybe even in a re-issued SDEIS.				
U1	<b>Cross Sections:</b>				
V1	Since I-25 as a radial route will always carry more traffic than I-70, it has not been proven that I-70 needs to be 10 lanes wide, when I-25 (T-REX) was built 8 lanes wide in Denver, although the cross sections are different due to the multitude of accel-decel lanes to accommodate the significant number of interchanges. It would appear that 8 lanes are sufficient to handle future I-70 volumes. Reducing the cross section to 200 feet will significantly minimize the impact on the neighborhood.				
W1	<b>Colorado Boulevard Interchange:</b>				
	CDOT seems to have some overwhelming desire to build the least efficient interchange design possible, namely the diamond interchange. The partial cloverleaf interchange works quite well, considering the significant volume of northbound traffic that enters I-70. A diamond interchange put this volume through a double left turn which will reduce the efficiency of Colorado Boulevard. Yes, it will require more land acquisition in the northwest quadrant, but what is that compared to a more efficient interchange design.				
X1	<b>Summary:</b>				
	All current trends are moving away from massive roadway widenings and towards reductions in vehicle miles travelled. If managed lanes are necessary in the future because we miscalculated, the shoulders can be converted as is done in other cities worldwide and as proposed by CDOT for the I-70 mountain corridor. This neighborhood has suffered for 50 years because of the onslaught of freeway building in the name of national defense. It is time to give back which the depressed section and cover es in change travel behavior through thoughtful planning will become a reality.				
T1	Several different frontage road systems were evaluated between Brighton Boulevard and Quebec Street on both sides of I-70, including two-way frontage roads for the entire length, a combination of one-way and two-way roads, and one-way the entire length.				
	In an effort to maximize local connectivity, the analysis indicated the best option was to use a combination of one-way and two-way frontage roads. The final solution was to have one-way frontage roads between Brighton Boulevard and Josephine Street, two-way between Josephine Street and Milwaukee Street, and one-way between Milwaukee Street and Quebec Street.				
U1	46th Avenue extends across Colorado Boulevard and connects with the existing one-way couplet of Stapleton Drive North and Stapleton Drive South. These streets are extended to the east and connect to the Quebec Street ramps to allow for connectivity between Colorado Boulevard and Quebec Street.				
	Further analysis indicated the potential to improve safety around Swansea Elementary School and to promote better accessibility to the cover would be achieved through the elimination of the frontage road between Columbine Street and Clayton Street on the north side of I-70.				
U1	The Final EIS adequately analyzes the reasonable alternatives and options. For information on why the Managed Lanes Option is identified as the preferred, please see PA7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.				
	Comments and comment responses are officially factored in to the Final EIS. Essentially the Final EIS is a reissued Supplemental Draft EIS incorporated with updated information from other project documents. The public will be given an opportunity to comment again on the Final EIS, where a more detailed discussion regarding general-purpose lanes and managed lanes is provided.				
V1	Widening has been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on the need for the number of lanes, please see GEN3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.				
W1	Alternate interchange configurations were analyzed in the 2008 Draft EIS and the partial cloverleaf alternative, while improving operations, would have impacts that would be unacceptable to the community.				
X1	The viaduct must be replaced soon, and the Preferred Alternative best meets the purpose and need for the project. During construction, CDOT will ensure that BMPs are used to minimize impacts. For information on other multimodal forms of transportation, please see TRANS1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.				
	Future driving trends were adequately considered during analysis. For information on future driving trends, please see TRANS11 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.				

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	445	Last:	Ruby
			First:	Teresa	
<p>Current Folder: <a href="#">SDEIS Comments Responded to</a></p> <p><b>Welcome:</b> <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p> <p><b>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</b></p> <p><b>From:</b> "Teresa Ruby"</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Tue, October 28, 2014 8:16 am</p> <p><b>To:</b> <a href="mailto:webmastercc@i-70east.com">webmastercc@i-70east.com</a> (<a href="#">more</a>)</p> <p><b>Priority:</b> Normal</p> <p>name: Teresa Ruby</p> <p>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Financing,Hazardous Materials,Managed Lanes,Noise,Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative,Truck Traffic</p> <p>comments: I am very concerned as a native of North Denver of this proposal. It is time to listen to the community and not make the same mistake that was originally made when I 70 was constructed where it is, going through both parks, Rocky Mountain and Berkeley. The environmental impact needs to be addressed more thoroughly, and real alternatives and solutions that deal with climate change need to be seriously considered. Stop this plan now and listen to the communities involved.</p>				<p><b>A</b> CDOT has no current or future plans to widen I-70 west of the I-25/I-70 interchange in Denver. For information on I-70, west of I-25, please see TRANS4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p> <p>The concern about outreach to the public has been adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on CDOT’s public involvement, please see OUT1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>	





Comments				Responses to Comments		
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	676	Last:	Ruibal-Kurylas	
		First:	Ramona			
<div>Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></div>						
<div>Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM</div>						
<div><div>From: "Ramona Ruibal-Kurylas"</div><div>Date: Fri, October 31, 2014 9:50 am</div><div>To: webmastercc@i-70east.com (<a href="#">more</a>)</div><div>Priority: Normal</div></div>						
<div>name: Ramona Ruibal-Kurylas</div>						
<div>A</div>	<div>comment_topic: Air Quality,Environmental Justice,Property Impacts,Swansea Elementary</div>					
	<div>comments: I am a Denver born, Colorado native. My primary concerns for the communities in Denver and the surrounding areas are for safety, housing, health, and education. I am gravely concerned about the widening of I-70 because of the several negative impacts it will have on the surrounding communities. I am even more concerned that these issues of impact have not been addressed. What will happen to displaced families who will lose their homes? How will the health of the people of these areas be addressed? I have listed other concerns below. Thank you for your time.</div>					
	<div>To: Mr. Don Hunt, Colorado Department of Transportation</div>					
	<div>From: Jill Fleishman, Kari Collins, Patrick Prag</div>					
	<div>Iliff School of Theology   2201 South University Boulevard, Denver, CO 80210</div>					
	<div>Subject: Social and Environmental Justice</div>					
<div>B</div>	<div>Comments on I-70 for the SDEIS Comment 1: We wish to express our serious concerns about the Colorado Department of Transportation's proposal to widen Interstate 70 in north Denver because of the devastation it will create in the mostly impoverished and Hispanic neighborhoods of Elyria-Swansea and Globeville between Colorado Boulevard and I-25.</div>					
	<div>Comment 2: Widening Interstate 70 in this corridor will significantly increase the public health threat that the highway's presence already poses to residents in these neighborhoods. The City of Denver's Health Impact Assessment showed that currently, residents living within 500 feet of the present highway experience significant pollution exposure, creating asthma levels over 40%, compared to 28% citywide.</div>					
	<div>Comment 3: Two elementary schools (Swansea and Garden Place) are within this 500-foot distance from I-70. Widening the highway will exacerbate these health concerns for children attending these schools.</div>					
	<div>Comment 4: These neighborhoods, like others along the I-70 corridor, are burdened with air contaminants and greenhouse gas emissions, causing high incidence of respiratory illness and other chronic disease that result in early death. Widening I-70 will result in expanding the zone of serious air quality and health impacts further into these neighborhoods.</div>					
	<div>Comment 5: We believe this proposal will seriously fracture the cohesiveness of</div>					
				<div>A</div>	<div>These concerns are adequately addressed in the Final EIS. For information on air quality and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>	
					<div>For information on property impacts, please see PROP2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>	
					<div>For full information on impacts and mitigation, please see Chapter 5, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation, of the Final EIS.</div>	
					<div>B</div> <div>CDOT recognizes that the project passes through environmental justice neighborhoods, and it has identified mitigation measures above and beyond standard mitigation measures to alleviate the impact on those neighborhoods. For more information, see Section 5.3, Environmental Justice of the Final EIS and EJ1 through EJ3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>	
					<div>C</div> <div>NAAQS limits set by EPA protect human health. The modeled air quality values for the I-70 East project are below the NAAQS and demonstrate that there is no exceedance or impact from the project based on EPA's health-based standards for these pollutants. For information on air quality and health, please see AQ1 and AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>	
					<div>D</div> <div>Swansea Elementary School has been identified as a very important and valuable resource in the Elyria and Swansea Neighborhood. The project team researched the neighborhood to identify another suitable locations for the school. The only available location identified was where the Swansea Recreation Center currently resides. The community expressed opposition to moving the school to the recreation center site because of the adjacent railroad tracks. The decision to keep the school at its current location was made during outreach opportunities conducted to review alternative sites for the school, and surveys of parents at the school during the PACT process. For information on mitigation for Swansea Elementary School, please see IMP4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>	
					<div>Garden Place Elementary School is not impacted by the I-70 East project, and therefore no mitigation measures are required. For information on air pollution near Swansea Elementary School, please see AQ3 and AQ5 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>	
					<div>E</div> <div>By 2035, the Preferred Alternative results in lower greenhouse gas emissions than the other Build Alternatives with general-purpose lanes only, but the difference is minor. For information on air quality and health, please see AQ4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>	
					<div>F</div> <div>The reason that CDOT proposed the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative was to mitigate the impacts of the project by reconnecting the community across the highway in response to community concerns. For information on the cover and connectivity, please see PA1, PA2, and PA9 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div>	

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	676	Last:	Ruibal-Kurylas
			First:	Ramona	
F	these neighborhoods. Elyria-Swansea and Globeville have yet to recover from the damage of when I-70 was first constructed fifty years ago. Numerous homes and local businesses were removed, and this access-limiting highway separated close-knit families and neighborhoods. The communities became detached from the rest of city and had to live with the negative effects of an elevated viaduct, including dirt, air pollution, noise, and shadows. This proposal of widening I-70 to more than 300 feet in width will remove the families living on 7 of 14 core blocks in Elyria displacing at least fifty families and will create further barriers between families and neighbors living north and south of the proposed expanded highway.				<b>G</b> As part of the mitigation included with the Preferred Alternative, CDOT will provide \$2 million to develop affordable housing units in the Elyria and Swansea Neighborhood through existing available programs. These programs have not been determined at this time.
G	Comment 6: Currently, there is no proposal for helping replace the housing stock that this project will remove with comparably priced housing in the same area. Displaced homeowners will not be equipped to find similar housing, and certainly not near the same neighborhood. This is a serious disruption of an already damaged social environment. Comment 7: Engineering that does not start with an understanding of neighborhoods and people is bad engineering. Engineering that does not advance community values and which results in displacement is social engineering at its worst. Comment 8: We oppose this proposal not only because it is unjust but also because it is immoral for what it does to the disenfranchised of our city. These neighborhoods will receive no significant social or environmental benefits with the approval of this proposal. Comment 9: This project does not improve connectivity, improve health and wellness of residents, make the community more livable nor provide benefits for improved mobility, especially given the high proportion of residents who do not own or operate motor vehicles.				<b>H</b> Comments received during public outreach efforts were considered by CDOT and reasonable and feasible mitigation ideas were incorporated in the project as appropriate. In response, the project team has developed additional mitigation measures beyond those required or normally provided in Colorado to lessen the adverse impacts in the project study area. For information on public involvement in the decision making process, please see OUT1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.
H	Comment 10: We request that the Colorado Department of Transportation develop a solution that listens to the needs and wants of				<b>I</b> The alternatives being evaluated were developed to avoid some impacts, minimize others, and mitigate the remaining impacts that could not be avoided or minimized. Additionally, these alternatives provide benefits, as discussed in the Final EIS, Section 5.3, Environmental Justice. For information on environmental justice considerations and plans to offset the project impacts, please see IMP1, EJ1, EJ2, and EJ3 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.
I	those who live in these neighborhoods. We seek an outcome that does not displace homes, families, or businesses in these neighborhoods. Comment 11: We seek a solution that demonstrably improves the health and wellness of residents beyond conditions that exist today that is, a solution that results in measurably better health conditions for residents, school children, workers and visitors to these neighborhoods. Comment 12: We request a solution that improves mobility and accessibility of residents of these neighborhoods, that does not continue to rely on fossil fuel technology, and provides instead new investments in transit, sidewalk completion, separation of railways, and bicycle connections. Comment 13: We request a solution that focuses foremost on improved connectivity within these neighborhoods and repairing the damage caused by locating I-70 here more than 50 years ago.				<b>J</b> The inclusion of the highway cover with an urban landscape and a community space helps achieve some broader community goals of livability, quality schools, and safe streets along with supporting the existing communities along the corridor. For information on connectivity and walkability and bicycle route improvements, please see TRANS2, PA1, PA2, and PA9 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.
J	Comment 14: We strongly affirm that investing in making these communities more complete, more vibrant, and healthier should be the city and state's priority, not damaging them further through this misguided proposal.				<b>K</b> CDOT conducted a thorough outreach process to all stakeholders and affected communities. The reason that CDOT proposed the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative was to mitigate the impacts of the project by reconnecting the community across the highway in response to community concerns. The information gathered during the outreach process has helped the project team refine the project alternatives.
K					<p>There is no viable solution, including the No-Action Alternative, that avoids all property impacts. For information on the No-Action Alternative, please see ALT1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>
L					<b>L</b> The inclusion of the highway cover with an urban landscape and a community space helps achieve some broader community goals of livability, quality schools, and safe streets along with supporting the existing communities along the corridor. In addition, the highway cover reduces noise impacts in adjacent areas. The cover will directly contribute to improved air quality, resulting in PM10 concentrations that are lower at Swansea Elementary School and the surrounding area than they would be in the future without the cover (No-Action Alternative). For information on air pollution and health, please see AQ3 through AQ6 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.
M					<i>Responses continue on the following page.</i>
N					
O					



Comments				Responses to Comments
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 676	Last: Ruibal-Kurylas	First: Ramona	
<div>This side intentionally left blank.</div>				<div>M</div> <p>The East Corridor commuter rail line that serves the same corridor as the I-70 East project is scheduled to open in 2016, and ridership on this line was included in traffic modeling used to determine what improvements are needed on I-70. For information on transit and bicycle/pedestrian improvements, please see TRANS1 and TRANS2 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>
				<div>N</div> <p>Reconnecting the Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods was a key core value identified by residents, and the Preferred Alternative effectively addresses those concerns, based on input we have received. The alternative maintains the same number of north-south through streets as exist today. The project will also provide wider, continuous sidewalks and new street lighting along 46th avenue and along the streets that cross over the highway. These improvements are in addition to the proposed cover. For information on community connectivity, please see PA1, PA2, and PA9 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>
				<div>O</div> <p>Comments received during public outreach efforts were considered by CDOT and reasonable and feasible mitigation ideas were incorporated in the project as appropriate. In response, the project team has developed additional mitigation measures beyond those required or normally provided in Colorado to lessen the adverse impacts in the project study area. Any mitigation measures included in the Record of Decision for the project must and will be completed. For information on project mitigation measures, please see IMP1 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p>

Comments				Responses to Comments																
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 234	Last: Ruppert	First: Ray																	
<div><div>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</div><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 31, 2014.</p><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Date: <u>10-1-14</u> Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>DON'T HAVE TO</i></p><p>Name (required): <u>RAY RUPPERT</u> <i>I AM ALREADY ON IT</i></p><p>Organization: _____</p><p>Address (required): _____</p><p>City/State/Zip: _____</p><p>Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p><table><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air quality</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Environmental justice</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financing</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous materials</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Historic</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> Managed lanes</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Noise</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Property impacts</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Swansea Elementary</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Visual</td></tr><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Truck traffic</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other</td><td colspan="2"><i>congestion</i></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.</p><div><div>A</div><div><p><i>CDOT,</i></p><p><i>The FURTHER CONSTRUCTION OF I-70 IS ABOUT HALF RIGHT FOR THE GOOD FLOW OF TRAFFIC. EAST BOUND I-70 FROM I-25 TO TOWER RD. SHOULD KEEP TRAFFIC FLOWING MODERATELY WELL. WEST BOUND I-70 FROM TOWER RD TO I-25 IS A WHOLE DIFFERENT STORY. I CAN IMAGINE IT BEING BACKED UP TO TOWER RD. THERE IS TRAFFIC CONGESTION AT I-70 AND I-25 NOW WITH 3 LANES OF WEST BOUND I-70 TRAFFIC. ONE CANNOT WIDEN I-25 BETWEEN 38TH AND I-70. IT IS AT ITS WIDEST POINT NOW. WEST BOUND I-70 WEST OF I-25 AND NORTH BOUND I-25 NORTH OF I-70 CANNOT HANDLE THE TRAFFIC</i></p><p>****CONTINUE ON BACK FOR MORE SPACE****</p></div></div><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 31, 2014, to:</p><p>I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p><div></div></div>						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental justice	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financing	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Historic	<input type="checkbox"/> Managed lanes	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Property impacts	<input type="checkbox"/> Swansea Elementary	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary identified preferred alternative	<input type="checkbox"/> Truck traffic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	<i>congestion</i>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental justice	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financing	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Historic																
<input type="checkbox"/> Managed lanes	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Property impacts	<input type="checkbox"/> Swansea Elementary	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual																
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary identified preferred alternative	<input type="checkbox"/> Truck traffic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	<i>congestion</i>																	
				<div><div>A</div><div><p>The transportation models used to analyze the project alternatives include all the approaches to, and all directions leaving, the mousetrap. For information on congestion along I-70, west of I-25, please see TRANS4 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</p></div></div>																



## Responses to Comments

First: Ray



A

AT rush hour either. LETS eliminate some Traffic entering into that interchange. IT IS NOT going TO get any better. LETS remove the west bound lanes of I-70 between Colorado Blvd and Brighton Blvd. and re-route that Traffic lessening ALL THAT Traffic entering the I-25/I-70 interchange. CDOT IS building a hi-way THAT IS NOT FULLY FUNCTIONAL. WE CAN do better. AS IT IS designed NOW, IT IS going TO create EXTRA Pollution, more congestion, unhappy residents, additional costs TO build AND further costs TO correct the problems this I-70 IS creating. Build it right the first time around. TAKE AN AERIAL PHOTO OF THE mouse trap area and beyond during rush hours in the morning and in late afternoon on a working week day so we all can see and know there IS Traffic congestion. And explain how this new I-70 west bound five lane is going TO alleviate Traffic congestion.



The information on these pages has been reviewed. Responses to specific comments are included on the previous page.

\*\*\*\*ATTACH MORE PAGES AS NEEDED\*\*\*\*

Thank you for your input.

Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 31, 2014, to:  
 i-70 East EIS Team  
 Colorado Department of Transportation  
 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222  
 Email: [contactus@i-70east.com](mailto:contactus@i-70east.com)



Comments				Responses to Comments																		
Source: Submittal	Document Number: 822	Last: Ruppert	First: Ray																			
<div><div>I-70 EAST SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</div><p>Please submit comments to the address below or via the I-70 East website (<a href="http://www.i-70east.com">http://www.i-70east.com</a>) by October 31, 2014.</p><p>Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary and protected in accordance with the Privacy Act. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for any further project notices.</p><p>Date: <u>10-22-14</u> Would you like to be included on the I-70 East EIS mailing list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Name (required): <u>RAY RUPPERT</u> <u>Already there</u> Organization: _____ Address (required) _____ City/State/Zip: _____ Email: _____</p><p>Does your comment apply to any of the topics listed below? Please circle all that apply:</p><table><tr><td>Air quality</td><td>Environmental justice</td><td>Financing</td><td>Hazardous materials</td><td>Historic</td></tr><tr><td>Managed lanes</td><td>Noise</td><td>Property impacts</td><td>Swansea Elementary</td><td>Visual</td></tr><tr><td>Preliminary identified preferred alternative</td><td>Truck traffic</td><td><u>Other</u></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table><p>Please print your comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS legibly below.</p><div><div>A</div><div><p>There is a lot of traffic going to I-70 from that ramp from York St. Most of that traffic is from Josephine. Since that ramp is going away the traffic will be heading for the Brighton Blvd. ramp along with other 46th Ave traffic. I am sure there will be a stoplight at 46th &amp; Brighton causing congestion. So build a ramp from 46th to I-70 west bound right before you get to Brighton. Looks like the ramp would be downhill to I-70. OR maybe build a ramp from 46th over Brighton Blvd. to the Brighton ramp to I-70 west bound avoiding the Brighton / 46th interchange.</p><p>****CONTINUE ON BACK FOR MORE SPACE****</p></div></div><p>Please turn in this form in to a project team member or mail/email by October 31, 2014, to: I-70 East EIS Team Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 S. Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222 Email: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a></p><div></div></div>						Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic	Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual	Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	<u>Other</u>			<div>A</div> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes improvements to the Brighton Boulevard intersections to accommodate projected traffic needs.</p>	
Air quality	Environmental justice	Financing	Hazardous materials	Historic																		
Managed lanes	Noise	Property impacts	Swansea Elementary	Visual																		
Preliminary identified preferred alternative	Truck traffic	<u>Other</u>																				



Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	707	Last:	Russo
				First:	Chris
Current Folder: SDEIS Comments Responded to					
Welcome: <a href="mailto:contactus@i-70east.com">contactus@i-70east.com</a>					
Re: I-70 EAST EIS - SDEIS COMMENT FORM					
From: "Chris Russo"					
Date: Fri, October 31, 2014 1:01 pm					
To: webmastercc@i-70east.com ( <a href="#">more</a> )					
Priority: Normal					
name: Chris Russo					
A	comment_topic: Environmental Justice,Swansea Elementary				
	comments: I do not understand all the consolations to Swansea Elementary school, the children who attend it, and the neighborhoods that surround it. So-called community leaders continue to refer to the area as a viable community, but those opinions are only romanticizing neighborhoods that are surrounded by brownfields. This is just another example of politicking for the minority so the politician can brand themselves as caring. The area is depressed and will remain so regardless of what happens to I-70. It has been said that DPS will not move Swansea Elementary, but considering the price tag and impact of the expansion of I-70, it seems that DPS is just being obstinate. The cost of a new school, when DPS claims they may have to expand the current school anyway, should not be a consideration if the concern is truly about impacts of air quality on kids. Indeed, when considering the highway project will likely exceed \$2billion, moving a school is peanuts. If DPS is holding out, then force the project to set aside \$2 million to build a new state-of-the-art school. That is, after all, 1000 times less than the highway project. I find it absurd that 600 kids should affect a project that will affect millions over time. I think the school, the kids, and the arguments about community are just a red herring. Honestly, someone should explain how those neighborhoods will be revitalized by burying the road or worse, moving it miles away (the I-270/I-76 ludicrous option). I agree that the viaduct was a bad idea, but it was born in a time when it was fashionable to build viaducts. Obviously, the intention is to not replace the viaduct, but the idea that an entire metropolitan area and travelers from around the country should be stymied by one elementary school and 600 kids (who will be replaced by another 600 kids during construction, and so on) is pure idiocy. It is the product of Environmental Justice, another awful idea that panders to an agenda. The neighborhoods most affected by the project are depressed, poor, and blighted. Whatever the reason they became that way is not the point. Many neighborhoods in many cities evolve -- some go from good to bad and then back to good through				
	A Any project this size will have impacts, however it is the responsibility of the government to avoid impacts when possible, minimize those that cannot be avoided, and mitigate for those that cannot be minimized to a reasonable level. Therefore mitigation measures have been listed commensurate to the impacts to the neighborhoods.				

Comments				Responses to Comments			
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	707	Last:	Russo	First:	Chris
<div>A</div> <div>gentrification. But these neighborhoods are not likely to experience any gentrification simply because they are surrounded by brownfield development. To argue that we should move the road or bury it at great expense because of a depressed, blighted neighborhood is shortsighted. After all, if the best laid plans don't pan out, do we next force industry to move? If so, where? Another neighborhood? And why should another neighborhood suffer brownfields? Government excels at wasting taxpayer money, and this is no exception. It is an old highway that needs to be replaced, but politics is turning it into a way to waste extravagantly. Take the school out of the equation, and it will make replacing the road easier. I'd be very curious then to see what new arguments against the project would be invented.</div>							
				<div>The information on this page has been reviewed. Responses to specific comments are included on the previous page.</div>			

Comments				Responses to Comments	
Source:	Submittal	Document Number:	013	Last:	Ryan
			First:	-	
<div><div>A</div><div><div>name: 'Ryan'</div><div>comment_topic: 'Other'</div><div>comments: '5 free lanes in each direction. If you want to add a toll lane, add a 6th. Two toll lanes + the 5 lanes in each direction would be even better. I've seen these types of projects in major cities like Phoenix, LA, Houston, and Dallas. It's time Denver step it up and start building for the future. A design like this supported by the new light rail would make a BIG difference in terms of congestion. But it would never get approved (funded) because the voters don't want Denver to "become the next LA." So I guess we'll settle for less. And people will enjoy some sitting in some more traffic. Case in point: How many drivers today wish I-25 had that 5th lane from 225-to downtown Denver like the original TREX plan called for?'</div></div></div>				<div><div>A</div><div>Detailed traffic modeling confirms the proposed improvements. For information on the need for 10 lanes and the Managed Lanes, please see GEN3 and PA7 of the Frequently Received Comments and Responses on the Supplemental Draft EIS, located in Part 1 of Attachment Q.</div></div>	